

SEVEN LETTERS

TO

“The Guardian,”

ON

THE REPORT OF PART OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE SYNOD OF ST ANDREWS, &c.,
PUBLISHED IN THAT PAPER,
JULY 3, 1850.

BY

THE REV. CHARLES WORDSWORTH, M.A.,
WARDEN OF TRINITY COLLEGE, IN THE SAME DIOCESE.

“Veritas est Optima Charitas.”

EDINBURGH:

R. GRANT AND SON, 82 PRINCES STREET.

J. H. PARKER, LONDON AND OXFORD.

M.DCCC.L.

"THE KING OF GREAT BRITAIN HAS NO WILL OF HIS OWN : NEITHER OUGHT ANY INDIVIDUAL BISHOP IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"UNLESS IT CAN BE PLEADED THAT A CLERGYMAN ONCE MADE A BISHOP, IN OUR CHURCH, IS EXEMPTED FROM ALL AUTHORITY BUT THAT OF THE GREAT BISHOP OF SOULS (WHICH WOULD MAKE THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH ANOMALOUS AS A CHURCH), THE MAJORITY OF THE BISHOPS HAVE A RIGHT TO EXPECT COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR DECISIONS BY THOSE OF THEIR OWN ORDER, IN LIKE MANNER AS BY THE OTHER TWO ORDERS OF ECCLESIASTICS."

Skinner's Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, pp. 499, 500.

PREFACE.

THE New Prayer-Book continues to be advertised and sold. The incorrect report of the proceedings of our Diocesan Synod has not been corrected or withdrawn. These facts must be my justification for complying with the wish of Friends, who have requested me to collect and republish the following Letters. In so doing, I request the attention of the Members of our Church to these few Prefatory remarks.

I. I have been accused of “agitating the Church” upon the subject of the New Prayer-Book.”

Before I had written *a single syllable upon the subject*, the following statements had been published, many of them in *three*, all of them in *one or more*, of the most widely circulating Church Newspapers and Reviews in England :—

1. That “the conduct of the Episcopal Synod” (the highest *standing* authority of the Church) “was contrary to the constitution of the Church of Scotland.”

That “the Episcopal condemnation was uncanonical.”

That “the act of the Bishops was null and void.”

That “such interference on the part of the Bishops was *ultra vires*.”

That “ they had decided on the question contrary to all rules of equity.”

That “ they were misled by inaccurate information.”

That “ there had been no appeal ” to them.

2. That “ the whole proceedings ” of the Diocesan Synod of St Andrews, where the Dean presided in place of the Bishop, his Father, were “ unconstitutional, unjustifiable, and schismatical.”

That the resolution they came to was “ a most painful Synodal act.”

That here “ was the Bishop’s Council presuming to censure their President for affixing his *imprimatur* to a Prayer-Book opposed to no Canon.”

3. That “ the publication of the Prayer-Book ” which the Episcopal Synod had condemned “ was most timely, and the Book itself most valuable,” no mention being made of its condemnation, which had occurred two months before.

That the Book “ was made by the Bishop of St Andrews.”

That “ it was made by the Bishop at the request of a majority of the Clergy of his Diocese.”

That it is “ a Reprint of the Scotch Prayer-Book of 1637.”

That “ it puts into Rubrics the Scotch Traditions handed down from the time of Laud.”

That it is “ according to the use of the Church of Scotland.”

That “ it is consonant, in every respect, to the ritual and usage of the Church of Scotland.”

That “ the prior usage had never been stereotyped because of the poverty of the Scottish Church.”

4. That “ Mr Wordsworth regarded the usage of Reservation of the Elements as contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles.”

That “ Mr Wordsworth volunteered an opinion that a Rubric in the New Prayer-Book is opposed to

the Thirty-nine Articles, which forbid the Reservation of the Lord's Body and Blood!"

That, "as an Englishman, perhaps Mr Wordsworth was not aware of the practice of the Church, in this respect, which has *always* been to reserve for the sick."

That "Mr Wordsworth intimated that proceedings would also be taken against the Bishop of the Diocese himself."

That "Mr Wordsworth of Trinity College is in a position where he is obliged to make use of the arguments (if they deserve the name) of Mr Drummond."

These statements, all of them more or less incorrect, had been circulated through every corner of the land *before I had written one syllable* upon the subject to which they refer; had been circulated, for the most part, by *the very Parties* who now accuse me of "agitating the Church." Might I not answer, in the words of the Prophet, "I have not troubled Israel, but thou ——?" And must I not ask—Is Truth for ever tamely to submit to untruth; law and order to lawlessness and insubordination?

II. I have been accused of "opposing my Diocesan."

My Diocesan unhappily (having looked elsewhere for Councillors, and not to the Council which the Church has assigned him, viz., the Synod of his Diocese, and which, at his advanced age, and in his state of incapacity for public business, he was doubly bound to consult) had incurred the censure of the Episcopal Synod, and had *disregarded* it, many weeks *before I took a single step* in the business,—beyond

writing to the Bishop of Brechin to enquire for information respecting the Book,—and beyond sending the copy of it, which I had obtained, to the Bishop of Glasgow, without *expressing any opinion whatever as to its internal merits*, and only requesting him (with a view to the Episcopal Synod then close at hand) to give to the matter the attention which it appeared to demand. So matters stood when I was summoned, after the usual form, to attend our Diocesan Synod. The authority of our own individual Bishop, and the superior authority of the Episcopal Synod, had been brought into direct collision ; and the Canons leave no doubt as to the duty of every Presbyter in such a case. To counteract or withstand a decree of the Episcopal Synod, is to go almost as far as it is possible for a Churchman to go in *disobedience*.

But in repudiating this new Prayer-Book, have I really, *pro tanto*, repudiated the authority of my Diocesan? My Diocesan is long past the time of life of which it is written in the Word of God, “ Yet is their strength then but labour and sorrow.” Add to this, he himself has told me (since the publication of my two first Letters in “ the Guardian ”) that the omission of the English Office (in my opinion by far the most important and most objectionable feature of this New Book) was NOT HIS DOING, nor *in accordance with his wish* ; that the drawing up of the new Rubrics was NOT HIS DOING ; nor as they stand, and imply a power to COMMAND, *in accordance with his intention*. Who, then, has done this thing which the Bishop has not done ? Who has assumed

this *supra-Episcopal* exercise of Ecclesiastical authority? The Synod of the Diocese has not done it, for it has known nothing of the Book either before or since its publication. WHO HAS? Surely it is indispensably necessary that an answer to this question should be forthcoming.

Meanwhile the Church reposes the issue, with perfect confidence, on the wisdom and firmness of the Episcopal Synod.

C. W.

ST ANDREWS, August 22.

P.S.—Since the foregoing Remarks were in print, a Letter from the Bishop, addressed to a *Layman*—whether of his own Diocese or no, does not appear—has been published in “the Guardian.”

I shall only observe upon it what follows:—

I went to Peterhead, without any intention of communicating with the Bishop (as I told him) respecting the Prayer-Book, or any other public matter, but in order to preach a sermon on behalf of Trinity College, as the Brother Clergyman who invited me (and with whom I had also other business, which in part gave occasion to my visit), can testify.

The Bishop cannot mean to say that *I* have “not correctly reported” what passed in our conversation, for he himself corrected and authorized me to use the public statement of it which I have made (see

below, p. 21.) And the printed Letter, which I have since addressed to him, and in which I have developed the substance, and drawn out the legitimate inferences of that conversation, he has since kindly acknowledged at some length, without the slightest intimation that he considers it to contain any thing which is incorrect or unfair.

My “proposed Prayer-Book” was a thought of the moment—intended to elicit the Bishop’s real sentiments with respect to the Book which bears his name. At the same time, it embodies, I confess, what I feel the want of, and what I should not be sorry to see done, by proper authority.

The avowal, on the Bishop’s part, that “it was not competent for him to hinder *a Presbyterian* from publishing *a Prayer-Book*, nor would he have done so, if he could;” because “it would have savoured of a domineering spirit—even of the spirit of persecution”—such an avowal seems to suggest all that is required to unlock the mystery of the whole transaction.

C. W.

*St Andrews,
Feast of St Bartholomew.*

LETTER FIRST.

SIR,—An article in your last paper, which pretended to give a Report of the Annual Meeting of the Synod of this Diocese, and in so doing made frequent mention of my name, renders it necessary for me to trouble you with a few lines.

You are probably not aware that our Synodical Meetings do not admit even the Laity of our own Diocese, and that it is quite inconsistent with all ordinary usage for any report to be published beyond the mere issue of the proceedings.

I shall not, therefore, imitate your correspondent in doing what must be considered at least a very questionable act—an act from which the Clergy hitherto in this, and every other Diocese of the Church, have, I believe, invariably abstained, not without good and wise reasons, as I am sure you will be ready to believe, and will yourself also, in some measure, be able to judge, from the very report which you have published. I shall not attempt to follow him through his very imperfect, and, as it seems to me, *not very correct nor very honest* representation of what was said both by myself and others, *in a serious deliberation of five hours*, upon the gravest and most painful matter that has come before us since I have been connected with the Diocese; but I shall beg to do what he has omitted, and what alone it is competent, I believe, for either of us to do in such a case, viz., request you to publish the Resolutions themselves which I did propose, and both of which were carried by a majority of *more than two to one* :—

“ Resolved—

“ 1. That this Synod, having received and heard the resolution of the Episcopal Synod ordering the suppression of a certain book, which purported to be “the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church of Scotland,” desires to express its entire

concurrence in the said resolution, and to convey to the Bishops its hearty thanks for the same.

“ 2. That this Synod feels bound in duty to record its strong disapproval of the use of the book which has been so condemned; and also its determination, should the book be adopted or recommended by any Clergyman of the Diocese, to institute canonical proceedings against the offender.”

I must decline to give you the unhappy history of the book referred to in these resolutions, because it was the express desire of the Synod of Bishops who condemned it that it should be consigned to oblivion.

But from what has already been brought before you, in this imperfect, and I suppose it will be felt *not a little strange and unintelligible* shape, you will have seen enough to guess that the Church in this country has dangers and difficulties of her own to contend with, scarcely less perplexing or less imminent than those which *English Churchmen* are called upon to encounter, though proceeding altogether from a different source; trials and difficulties which the publication of the views of a *disabled disputant, in a minority of five, under the garb of an impartial and semi-official report*, is not likely to diminish, but rather, I must fear, to aggravate and embroil.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

Trinity College, Glenalmond, July 6, 1850.

LETTER SECOND.

SIR,—The matters connected with the recent Synod of this Diocese, which your anonymous correspondents have thought right to bring before the public, it would be impossible *to argue out*, within the limits which I could expect you to allow me for such a purpose, even in self-defence.

I must therefore request you to give me leave to lay before your readers the following FACTS, from which *they will be able to*

draw their own conclusions. Even well-informed Churchmen in England are so little acquainted with the actual state and peculiar difficulties of the Church in this country, that it becomes the more necessary to put them upon their guard against representations which would enlist their sympathies, or, what is worse, arouse their enmities, upon false grounds, and which, it is right they should know, proceed from a *small party* of men, who, in the extreme old age of our venerated Bishop, are making this Diocese an arena for schemes which they would not venture to attempt in any other, and whose zeal (I regret extremely to add) is not, in my opinion, “according to *knowledge*,” or *charity*, or *truth*.

Our Bishop, who resides at Peterhead, about eighty miles to the north of the most northern part of his Diocese, which he has not been able to enter for nearly three years, being now at the age of eighty-seven, *without consultation with his brother Bishops, or with the Clergy* of his own Diocese*, without even informing the other Bishops of the Church of what he was about to do, or communicating with them when he had done it, has recently affixed to a new Prayer-Book the following recommendation:—“I hereby certify that I have carefully examined this edition of the Book of Common Prayer, and that it is in strict conformity with the usage of the Church of Scotland, and I accordingly recommend it to the use of the Clergy of my Diocese.”

This Prayer-Book has been condemned by the Episcopal Synod of our Church under the following circumstances:—Happening to be in Edinburgh on April 7, and then and there to hear, *for the first time*, that a new Prayer-Book was in print for the use of this Diocese, and moreover that it was not to be publicly issued till after the Synod of Bishops, which was to meet at Aberdeen on the 19th, for fear that it should be taken hold of and condemned by them, I naturally felt anxious on so grave a matter, and endeavoured to obtain from the publisher a copy of the book. In this I succeeded. He sent me a copy *ready bound*. Three days afterwards, when I had returned home, I received from him a note, in which he requested me “to keep the issue of the Prayer-

* One of your correspondents has led you to believe that the book which our Clergy *have condemned, emanated from them*. I shall hope to notice this misrepresentation in a future letter.—See Letter iv. p. 22, and Letter vii. p. 55.

Book private, as he was not yet authorised to make it public." Meanwhile, I had sent it to the Bishop of Glasgow with a request that he would examine the book, and would give to so momentous a matter the consideration it deserved. In this manner it was brought a few days after under the notice of the Bishops (only one of whom, I believe, had been made aware of the intended publication), when they met in Synod at Aberdeen. The resolution which they passed respecting it (by four to one) was as follows:—

(Copy.)

" Sent by order of the Episcopal Synod to the several Synod Clerks, &c.

" [This paper is sent, not with a view of giving needless publicity to what should not be made more generally known than is unavoidable, but in order that if the matter referred to should (which is not unlikely) transpire, the Clergy may know the view which has been taken of it by the Episcopal College.]

" Extract Minute of Proceedings of the Episcopal College at their recent Synod, April 17–19, 1850, at Aberdeen.

" The attention of the Synod was called to a Prayer-Book lately printed and issued by Mr Lendrum of Edinburgh, purporting to be a Prayer-Book 'according to the use of the Church of Scotland,' and containing many matters which are neither contained in any parts of the Book of Common Prayer adopted by this Church, nor adopted by any General Synod as the use of the Church of Scotland; to which book is prefixed a recommendation from the Bishop of St Andrews to the Clergy of his Diocese.

" The Synod resolved:—

" That the publication of a book purporting to be the Prayer-Book according to the use of the Church of Scotland, without any sanction from a General Synod, nor even from the Episcopal College, is an instance of high presumption on the part of Mr Lendrum, and those who have employed him; and that the sanction of a single Bishop, which has been obtained, does not extenuate the offence of which Mr Lendrum and his employers have been guilty.

" The Synod directs that this resolution be communicated to

Mr Lendrum, and also to the Bishop of St Andrews, with the expression of its earnest hope and command (so far as its commands can be legitimately issued) that Mr Lendrum will take all possible means to recall any copies already issued, and to suppress the remainder of the edition; and the Synod directs that the Bishop of St Andrews, &c., be requested to withdraw his imprimatur.

(Signed)

“ W. J. TROWER,

“ Bishop of Glasgow, &c.

“ Clerk to the Episcopal Synod.”

Against this act of the Episcopal Synod, it has been argued by your correspondents:—

1. That it was uncanonical, “ *ultra vires*,” and that because by Canon XXXIV. the Bishops in Synod can only interfere *in cases of appeal*. I answer—I myself, a Presbyterian of this Diocese, had referred the matter to the judgment of the Bishops.

2. That it was illegal (which I suppose is also meant by “ unconstitutional,” in your first report), because the parties condemned were not heard in their own defence. I answer—a printed book is a fact which admits of no question; and the fact in the present case was of so grave a kind as to require the Bishops to proceed at once, *ne quid Ecclesia detrimenti caperet*.

The title of the Prayer-Book is as follows:—“ *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of Scotland.*” This title is both illegal and uncanonical: *illegal*, because “ the Church of Scotland ” is the legal title of the Presbyterian Establishment; * *uncanonical*, because it invades the Dioceses of other Bishops. It virtually professes that this book is the only genuine Prayer-Book of the whole “ Church of Scotland.” Had it only professed to be according to the use of the Church *in this Diocese*, the profession would have been *untrue* in regard to the actual *use of more than one-half of our Congregations*; now it is not only untrue, *in far greater proportion, in five out of six of the other Dioceses*, but it usurps, or rather denies, the rights of all the other Bishops of the Church, *no one of whom administers “ the Sacraments and other Rites and Cere-*

* See Appendix (A.)

monies of the Church," according to the use of this new book. Your readers will begin to be *incredulous* (as well they may) at such a recital; or if they cannot believe it (I would almost hope they might not), surely they will be ready to exclaim, "Alas! for Episcopacy in Scotland, whose cause is still no better managed than it was in the days of Laud, by those who are clamorous to be regarded as its *best*, or rather as its *only friends*." What I have now stated may help to lay in your readers' minds a *foundation for the truth*. I shall hope to continue my letter, with your permission, next week, when I shall have other *facts* to communicate which I am afraid will be found *no less astonishing, and no less necessary to be told*, since your correspondents will have it so, for the right understanding of the matters which they have chosen to misrepresent.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

Trinity College, Glenalmond, July 12.

LETTER THIRD.

SIR,—I now beg leave to continue my recital of **FACTS** in answer to your correspondents, who, beginning with an irregular, unauthorised, and *ex parte* report of our late Synod, have gone on to arraign my conduct before your readers, without enabling them to understand the true merits of the case upon which they have invited them to pass judgment.

There are at present *one hundred and eighteen* Congregations of the Church in this country. Of these, *forty* receive the Holy Communion according to what is called the Scottish Office, and the other *seventy-eight* according to the English; that is, of the whole number of Churches and Ministers in this country, **TWO-THIRDS** have *no other* use, and in most cases *never had any other use*, for the administration and reception of the Eucharist but the English form; and if this calculation were to be extended to the number of individual members who at present compose the several Congregations, the disproportion would probably be increased

up to FOUR OR FIVE TO ONE. I am not saying how this has come to pass, or whether it be good or bad, well or ill, for the Church ; I am merely stating A FACT—that so the Church *is*, actually, lawfully, canonically ; that these members are *bonâ fide* members of the Church in this country, they are received at her altars, they contribute largely to her resources, they have equal voices in her Synods, they INCLUDE FIVE OF HER SEVEN BISHOPS, and SIX OF HER SEVEN DEANS ;—and against *this fact* I have to set down *another*. The new Prayer-Book which has been brought under the notice of your readers as being entitled “ THE BOOK of COMMON Prayer,” and as containing “ the Administration of the SACRAMENTS according to the use,” or “ in strict conformity with the usage of the Church of Scotland,” DOES NOT CONTAIN THE ENGLISH OFFICE. Add to this, that a considerable portion of this large majority would rather leave the Church (I say nothing in their defence—I merely speak of them *as they are*—and if “ weak ” or ignorant, who is to bear “ the burden ” or the blame ?) than listen to any proposal for *using* the other office—a fact *in posse* no less certain and well known than the former fact *in esse* ;—put together all this, and you will have before you *one example* of what I said in my last letter, viz. that the “ zeal ” of the champions of this new book is not “ according to knowledge,” or charity, or truth,

It is no part of my object to go into matters which have not been misrepresented by your correspondents. Heartily, most heartily, do I wish that the charitable desire of the Episcopal Synod had been responded to, and that “ no needless publicity ” had been given to this most painful affair. But whether it was *lawful* for me to be silent under circumstances such as those which I shall now describe, let your readers judge. It is they who are appealed to, most improperly, as I think, against the Bishops and Synods of the Church ; and though I must decline and protest against such an appeal, yet if (as I doubt not) they love the truth, and hate *recklessness of assertion*, which would impose upon their sympathy and mislead their ignorance, in order to gain an end, be it good or bad, I shall have no fear for the result.

At the Synod I am reported to have said, that “ I regarded the reservation of the elements (in the Eucharist) as contrary to

the Thirty-nine Articles." This is untrue. Almost the only thing which I am reported to have said in that anxious and protracted discussion I did not say. I quoted the "*non servabatur ex instituto Christi*" of the Latin (28th) Article; and I remarked that it was a nice and difficult question, requiring the grave and solemn deliberation of competent authority to determine, how far subscription to that Article could be reconciled with the new Rubric, which not only suffers, but *commands* the Priest to *reserve*. There is much to be said in favour of *reserving*—this I freely admitted; but the question is not what *we* may fancy or prefer, but what is and has been the determination of the Church. The Scottish Communion office, which, by Canon XXI. (Scotch Code) is of "primary authority," has no Rubrics. But the English Office, which is also authorised by the same Canon, though in a secondary degree, has Rubrics, and among the rest, one upon reserving of the elements; and so has also the new Prayer-Book. Let me set the two Rubrics side by side:—

English Rubric.

"If any (of the bread and wine) remain which was consecrated, *it shall not be carried out of the Church*, but the Priest and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, *immediately after the blessing*, reverently eat and drink the same."

New Scotch Rubric.

"The Priest *shall reserve* so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the Communion of the sick, and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church."—(*Rubric in Communion Office.*)

"If the sick person be not able to come to the Church, and yet is desirous to receive the Communion, he must give timely notice to the Curate, who shall thereupon carry the same unto him, if *he have it reserved*."—(*Rubric in Communion for Sick.*)

Here, then, is a dilemma, for at least *seventy-eight* out of our *hundred and eighteen* Ministers and Congregations; that is, for all those who use the English Office. I say *at least* seventy-eight, because it is pretended that the Scottish Canon XXVIII., the title of which is, "On the Uniformity to be observed in Public Worship," which mentions uniformity as "necessary in all the ordinary parts of Divine Service," and which enacts that, "in the performance of *Morning and Evening Service*, the words and *rubrical directions* of the English Liturgy shall be strictly ad-

hered to," has nothing to do with this question (that is, in the administration of Holy Communion, *uniformity* is not necessary, because communion is no part of "public worship," no part "of Morning Service," no "ordinary part of Divine Service!") and again, that Canon XX., which orders that "every Clergyman shall pay attention to the *spirit and design of the Rubrics prefixed* to the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper in the Book of Common Prayer," that is, the English Prayer-Book, has likewise nothing to do with this matter, because the Rubric in question is not "prefixed," is not at the *beginning*, but the *end* of the Office.* Be it so, then. It is not ALL, but *only* five of our seven Bishops, *only* six of our seven Deans, *only* seventy-eight of our hundred and eighteen Ministers, and more especially all of English ordination, who are to be placed in this awkward predicament; who are to be told by a single Bishop that the use and order "of the Church of Scotland" is that "the Priest *shall* reserve;" while the Order of the Book according to which they minister is, "that the elements *shall not* be carried out of the Church," but shall be "immediately" consumed.

I could wish, Mr Editor, that the matter stopped here, for I fear there will be found still less of "knowledge," of "charity," and of "truth," in what is yet to come. One of your correspondents, whose communication you appended to my first letter, induced you to publish these words:—"As an Englishman, perhaps, Mr Wordsworth was not aware of the practice of the Church in this respect, which has *always* (so) been to reserve for the sick." It may be your correspondent is the same writer who has favoured the *Christian Remembrancer* for the *present month* (July) with a laudatory notice of the new Prayer-Book, suppressing all mention of its condemnation in *April* by the Episcopal Synod. The article commences thus:—"Bishop Torrey has added to the many services for which the Church of Scotland has to thank him, by a *reprint* of the Scotch Prayer-Book. It puts into Rubrics the Scotch traditions, handed down from the times of Laud, by such men as Falconer, A. Campbell, Rattray, and Jolly, to the present venerable Editor. Thus, the *reserved Sacrament*, the mixed cup, the order for the reserved gifts, the method of reception, are committed to writing, instead of being any longer left to oral

* Compare p. 37; and see Appendix (E.)

tradition." "A REPRINT of the Scotch Prayer-Book!" "Thus, the reserved Sacrament," &c. &c.! *Ab uno disce omnes*. Let us see how the Scotch Prayer-Book has been reprinted!—how, in the times of Laud, the Sacrament was *reserved*! how probable it is that Mr Wordsworth was not aware that the practice of the Church in this respect has *always* been to reserve for the sick! The Scotch Prayer-Book here referred to—the only Prayer-Book which the Scotch Church has ever had of its own—which goes by the name of Laud, but which Laud himself has testified was *not* his work, but was composed by the then Bishops of the Scottish Church, in 1637 (see the "History of his Troubles and Trial," p. 113), has the following Rubric—the only source from which we can certainly learn what was the *authoritative use* of the Church in this country *at that time*.

Let me now set the two Scotch Rubrics side by side :—

Scotch Rubric, 1637.

"And if any of the bread and wine remain, which is consecrated, it shall be reverently eaten and drunk by such of the Communicants only as the Presbyter which celebrates shall take unto him, but it shall not be carried out of the Church. And to the end there may be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least," &c. &c.

Scotch Rubric, 1850.

"The Priest shall reserve so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the Communion of the sick, and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church."

It is needless to remark upon this comparison, but there is one thing which it is necessary to point out. The Scottish Bishops, who, we are told, *always reserved*, were actually THE FIRST TO FORBID RESERVING! The previous English Liturgies of 1549, 1552, 1559, and 1604, had no such Rubric; the English Rubric of 1662, for the first time forbidding to reserve, was taken and formed after the Scotch of 1637! Your readers will now be able to discover *something* more of what I meant when I spoke of "recklessness of assertion," and of a "zeal not according to knowledge, and charity, and truth." But who will inform the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer*? Will they still be left to believe that "*shall reserve*" is a *reprint* of "*shall not be carried out of the Church*;" that the "*mixed cup*" is a *reprint* of "*the wine prepared for the Sacrament*;" and so of the rest? Or is this conclusion to be evaded by the alternative (I need not say *how*

consistent), that these Scotch traditions are now for the first time put into Rubrics, having been handed down from the days of Laud, when it is plain that the Bishops in Laud's time *knew them not*, or, if they knew them, *drew up their Rubrics purposely to forbid them?*

But I am sorry that I have not yet done with this grievous proof which has been produced of my ignorance of Scottish usages, and of my faithlessness and treachery towards the Church in this country, which my life is devoted to assist and serve. I have said that *seventy-eight* of our *hundred and eighteen* ministers, including *five* of our *seven* Bishops, would be placed in a dilemma by this new Rubric. That is, I suppose them to be all *consistent* men, and that in using the English Office they would not feel themselves at liberty to act contrary to the Rubrics of that Office; and, more especially, of the large proportion of them who have received English orders, I suppose that on coming to minister in this country *they brought their ordination vows along with them*—"coelum non animum mutant;" they did not mean to cast off their allegiance to their English Mother. *I, for one, certainly never meant to do so*, though this was attributed to me at the time by the *schismatical party* in this country, to whom I am now compared by these friends and champions of our venerable Diocesan. But, more than this, as Warden of this College, I am bound to use, and I do thankfully use, both Offices alternately, every Sunday. I put them both, equally, into the hands of our Boys and Theological Students, and I do so with perfect confidence. This I have done now for three years, and, so far as I can judge, with the best results.* But once admit this new Book as embodying *the use of the Scottish Church*, and as recommended by my Diocesan (whose recommendation in such a case ought to have the force of law), and in what a predicament am I placed! How am I to teach obedience to the Church? How can I point any longer to the Prayer-Book as the law, which, next to the Word of God, our Young Men and Boys are taught to reverence and obey, when I shall have put into their hands *two Rubrics which directly contra-*

* The number of admissions to Communion of our own Members (College and Household), *not including strangers*, during the half-yearly term which has just now ended, has been 909; and the amount of sums received at the Offertory during the same period, L.129, 9s. 1½d.

dict each other? Our good Bishop sees and knows (it may be) nothing of all this, but I cannot so readily acquit HIS ADVISERS of an offence towards myself, and my brother Clergy who assist me in this place;—an offence, *minor, indeed, in degree, but precisely similar in kind*, to that of which the Judicial Committee of Privy Council have been guilty towards the Bishop of Exeter, or rather towards the whole English Church, by recommending us to teach and hold, that to reconcile the Articles with the Prayer-Book, or the Rubrics among themselves, so as to form one consistent body of the Church's law, is a matter of no concern; and that Boys and Men must be allowed, and *ordered* to receive, as equally good and true, words that plainly and literally contradict each other in regard to the administration of the Holy Sacraments!

“Eheu!

Quam temere in nos-met legem sancimus iniquam!”

I need not say, Sir, how gladly I would have been spared the part which I have been compelled to take,—first, in our Synod, and now in the columns of your Journal, with respect to this unhappy Book; both on other accounts, and because I am well aware how undesirable it is for persons in an office like mine to mix themselves up with controversy. But I hardly know how I could *honestly* have remained where I now am, and where no ambition of my own, but the call of the united Episcopate of this Church, has placed me, unless I had done that which has exposed me to these misrepresentations. And, certainly, this is not a time in which any man, much less a guardian of Youth, and an instructor of Candidates for Holy Orders, can *innocently* sit by and suffer contradictions to be introduced, *secretly and surreptitiously*, after the very pattern of that “unostentatious” policy which we all so loudly condemn when it proceeds from the State, into the law and teaching of the Church.

Other FACTS remain, of which it is necessary that your readers should be rightly informed, if they are to pass a sound judgment upon the persons and practices of the Church in this country. And these I propose to bring before them, with your permission, in my next letter.* I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

Trinity College, Glenalmond.

* See Letter v.

LETTER FOURTH.

SIR,—I shall be obliged to you to publish the following documents in your next paper. If you object to receive them as an ordinary communication from a correspondent, please to insert them as an advertisement.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

July 22.

No. I.

Peterhead, July 21, 1850.

REV. DEAR SIR,—It would be well to rewrite literally the enclosed, as my meaning in our late conversation, and I will, with pleasure, give my assent to it. The inserted alterations are very few. Yours very truly,

PATRICK TORRY, *Bp.*

To the Rev. Charles Wordsworth,
Warden of Trinity College.

No. II.

In a conversation held at Peterhead with the Right Rev. Patrick Torry, D.D., Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, on the Eighth Sunday after Trinity, 1850 (July 21), his Lordship spoke to me to the following effect, with reference to the Prayer-Book recently edited with his name prefixed :—

That he should never have thought of editing a new Prayer-Book, except in compliance with a requisition which he received from certain of his Presbyters, bearing date *Muthill*, 1847, a copy of which he put into my hands. (*See below*, No. III.)

In this paper he was requested “to edit such a Book as should serve as a document of reference and authority in regard to the practice of our Church.”

To this requisition the Bishop said he consented ; and he added, that in so doing, he intended the Book also for general use, and in all Congregations disposed to receive it, because of its superior excellence and truth in respect of Eucharistic Doctrine.

His Lordship further stated, that he should have had no objection whatever to the introduction of the English Communion

Office in the new Book; and that from its being *now* the actual use of a large portion of the Church, would not have been displeased to see it inserted.

That his Lordship did not draw up the Rubric which commands the *reservation* of the Elements, and had no intention of contradicting the English Rubric, but simply of testifying that reserving *for the sick*, and those disabled by age, had been the use of the Church of Scotland *at the three great festivals*, and the Bishop thinks such a practice creditable to its piety and orthodoxy.

That he would have no objection to sanction and recommend a Prayer-Book, which should contain the *two uses* for the administration of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and of the Rite of Confirmation* (precedence being given to the Scottish Eucharistic form, as of "primary authority" in this country), provided I would undertake to bear the risk of publication, and to submit the Book previously to his inspection.†

(Signed) CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

No. III.

Copy of a Paper received from the Rev. JOHN TORRY, Dean of the Diocese of St Andrews, &c., July 19, 1850.

The Meeting at which the following Address was presented and subscribed was not a Synod, but a *private meeting* held at Muthill, on the occasion of the Bishop's being there to consecrate the new Church at Crieff.

I attended that Meeting in the vestry of the Church at Muthill, without knowing the object of it till the Petition to the Bishop was brought forward and discussed. I expressed, at the time,

* The only Scotch variation from the English use is in the addition of the sign of the Cross, and these words from the Bishop :—" I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, and I lay mine hands upon thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

† This will show abundantly how far the Bishop is from entertaining any exclusive or intolerant feeling towards the English Office.

Of course, if such a publication were to be undertaken, (for the benefit of those who either use both Offices, or desire to have the Scotch Office with the English Prayer-Book, *i. e. the whole authorised Liturgy of the Scottish Church*), it would not be done without the previous cognizance and approval of the Bishops of the Church; nor would it alter, add, or suppress a single word in the authorised Offices, or in the Rubrics, as they at present stand.

my dissatisfaction at the Prayer of it, and stated that, in my opinion, the publication of the proposed Prayer-Book for use in our Church was uncanonical. But I was assured that *it was not intended to make use of it in Public Worship,* but merely as a memorial of certain usages*, which have been, and still, in some cases, existed in the Scottish Church; and I declare that on this understanding alone did I at length reluctantly consent to sign the Petition.

(Copy.)

To the Right Rev. PATRICK TORRY, D.D., Bishop of St Andrews, &c. &c.

We, the undersigned Clergy of the Diocese of St Andrews, &c., deeply sensible of the importance of having the Liturgy and usages of the Scottish Church during the last century attested by a Prelate of your Lordship's age and experience, beg to express our desire that you should edit such a Book as shall serve *as a document of reference and authority in regard to the practice of our Church.*

Signed, J. Torry, Dean; T. M'Millan, Alex. Lendrum, Thomas Walker, T. C. Chambers, Thomas Wildman, Presbyters; William Palmer, Deacon.†

LETTER FIFTH.

SIR,—I showed in my third Letter that the new Prayer-Book, which purports to be “*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments according to the Use of the Church of Scotland,*” is *not* according to the *present actual use* of the great majority of the Members who compose the Church in this country; *nor* according to the *use of the only Scotch Prayer-Book which has preceded it*, and which was put forth when the

* It was upon hearing that the Book had been recommended and used in Public Worship at Crieff, Perth, and elsewhere, that my resolutions respecting it, at our recent Diocesan Synod, were brought forward.

† Of these seven, *two* have objected against the new Prayer-Book, and *one* never was an instituted Clergyman of the Diocese, and has since left it altogether.

Church of Scotland had her full complement of twelve Bishops and two Archbishops, including among them the names of Spotswoode and William Forbes, men worthy to be compared for sanctity, learning, and orthodoxy, with the greatest Divines and Prelates of the English Church.

On what authority, then, it will be asked, does the use of this new Book *pretend* to rest, in so far as it differs from the Offices and Rules for Public Worship which are at present actually received and observed by the Church? The answer is, *On the authority of the unwritten tradition of the usages of the last Century.*

“It puts into Rubrics the Scotch traditions, handed down from the times of Laud, by such men as Falconar, Campbell, Rattray, and Jolly, to the present venerable editor.” “It contains nothing but what has the authority of the Scottish Church.” “The Scottish usages of undoubted authority are now embodied in the Book of Common Prayer.”

Such are the claims and representations of its advocates. *Unwritten tradition* is not always a safe foundation to go upon, as we know from the traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and from the traditional practices of the Church of Rome. But let us waive this objection in favour of the present Book, and of the good, and holy, and orthodox Bishop (for such he is) who has been induced to prefix to it his honoured name. Let the Book be all that its advocates assert, “the most perfect Prayer-Book now in existence;” and let the Bishop be the man “whose age, whose consistent practice, and, above all, whose wisdom and sound judgment, rendered him the best fitted for such a task,” (for my own part, I have no wish to contest either proposition), and then let us see how the case stands, not as matter of bold and broad assertion, but of plain historical FACT.

It is easy to impose upon the ignorance of English Churchmen by parading before their eyes the names of Bishops Falconar, and Campbell, and Gadderar, and Alexander, and Petrie—men of whom they will know nothing—and of Bishops Rattray and Jolly, whom they know only to admire and love; and again, by attaching to these the great and illustrious name of Laud, who was martyred full half a century before the eldest of them was ordained. So much has been said of the “peculiar Scotch rites,” and of “venerable Scotch usages,” and of the faithlessness of “English

Priests coming amongst us, not to work out the system of the Church as they find it, but to assimilate it to the English system," that it will be difficult to divest the minds of your readers of these, for the most part equally untrue and uncharitable ideas; *untrue*, so far as they would represent that the traditions, *for the first time printed* in this new book, are as *old as the Revolution of 1688*, or, strictly speaking, ARE SCOTCH TRADITIONS AT ALL; *untrue and uncharitable*, inasmuch as they calumniate "English Priests;" yes, and "indigenous Priests" (and why not Bishops, too, both English and indigenous, who are still more deeply involved?) for not carrying out a system WHICH HAS NO REAL EXISTENCE beyond *the single use of the Scottish Office*—a matter which the author of this statement must know depends, in general, not upon the Clergy themselves, whether English or Scotch, but upon the Congregations who elect them, and who take care to choose a Minister whose views and practices are agreeable to their own. Witness the conduct of the late truly Catholic and "indigenous" Bishop Moir, who, to secure the peace and unity of the Church at Brechin (whether rightly or wrongly), exchanged the Scottish for the English Office. Witness the conduct of the present "indigenous" and holy-minded Bishop who has succeeded him, Bishop Forbes, who loving, as he is known to do, the Scottish Office, and desiring to do all he can to uphold it, yet has bound himself (whether rightly or wrongly) to his Congregation at Dundee, never even to attempt to introduce it. Add to these the practice of the "indigenous" and munificent Dr Low, the present Bishop of Moray and Ross, now past his 80th year, who *never administers the Communion* according to the only use of this new book, and *never confirms*, as this book *orders* the Bishop to administer Confirmation. Let your readers, I say, look at these FACTS, and they will perceive that they are not in the way to arrive at THE TRUTH in this question, when they listen only to complaints of the pretended perfidy of "English Priests."*

Still I am aware that it will be no easy task to arrest these current misrepresentations, so industriously have they been circulated, and so naturally do they appeal to and fall in with the

* The "indigenous" and learned Mr Cheyne of Aberdeen, who has written an able and excellent vindication of the Scottish Office, nevertheless speaks of himself as "being debarred the use of that venerable form."—p. 9. This is what English readers will *hardly* understand; but they must try to understand it, if they are to

present too late awakened sympathies, and too quickly fretted, though most justly exasperated, tempers of our brethren in England. And yet, *a priori*, no competent judge of past events, civil or ecclesiastical, would expect to find long-standing traditions in a Church and country which has undergone such frequent and such violent convulsions as have been suffered here, where the very succession of Bishops has *twice* died out, and been *twice* renewed since the time of the Reformation; and, *a posteriori*, I think I can undertake to prove that *no tradition or use whatever*, beyond the *simplest administration* of the two Sacraments,* and the recitation, perhaps, of the Creed, and doubtless of the Lord's Prayer, *can be traced in this Church so high as the commencement of the last Century*. In England, when you think or speak of the rules and Discipline of the Church, you are thinking or speaking of matters which were settled *two or three Centuries ago*. In this country, thinking and speaking upon the same matters, we have to think and speak comparatively of YESTERDAY—I mean as regards *the fixed law of the Church*. We have no “Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church,” but the English Prayer-Book, with the addition of the so-called Scotch Communion Office, itself also borrowed, as I shall presently show, in all its essentials, from England; and though these have now been in use, more or less regular, since the early part of the last Century (the former having been introduced about 1710, and the latter not long afterwards);† yet it was not till *the commencement of the present Century* that the General Synods of Laurencekirk (1804), and of Aberdeen (1811), did for this Church the work which the English Convocation had done in 1549, 1552-3, and 1562, and the authorised Offices for public worship (together with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles), became binding in strict rubrical uniformity upon

judge rightly upon this or any other question in the Scottish Church. The same writer also makes honourable mention of the upright dealing of “the Ministers of the Church of England,”—p. 41. Compare also Skinner's Annals, p. 434, where it appears that the “Junior Clergy of Scottish ordination” were the first to abandon the Scotch Office.

* After the Restoration, Baptism was administered *without the sign of the Cross*, and with the recitation *only* of the Apostles' Creed, and the holy Eucharist was received *without kneeling*.—*Skinner's History*, ii., p. 467.

† Skinner's History, ii. p. 606 and p. 633. Lathbury, pp. 446-8, 451, 454. Skinner's Annals, 298-9.

Priests and Deacons ; and ultimately, at the revision of the Canons by the Synod of Laurencekirk, in 1828, upon BISHOPS also. *Up to the time of these Synods* it was not, perhaps, *uncanonical* for each Bishop, within certain restrictions, to order what use he pleased for his own Diocese, though not, of course, for the whole " Church of Scotland ;" and Bishop Torry, in his *recommendation* prefixed to this new Book (though not so in the TITLE-PAGE, and in the RUBRICS, which are couched *imperatively*, as the *order* for the whole Church), has in fact done little more than he may remember other Bishops to have done in his youth, and even in the early period of his own Ministry. But *since that time* it is as idle for us in this Church to appeal to prior, I cannot say *pristine*, usages, in support of any practices which contradict or interfere with our present Rubrics, as it would be for a Minister in the Church of England to refer to the ante-Reformation uses of Bangor, York, or Sarum, for what he is to say or do in public worship, where his Prayer-Book plainly gives him the directions he requires. Unwritten traditions of minor importance will still *exist* in both Churches, but only such as may *consist* with the written law ; in all other cases, be the traditions as ancient and universal as in the present instance they are *recent* and *partial*, the WRITTEN LAW CUTS OFF THE ENTAIL.

But let us look to our FACTS a little more closely.

It was not till the beginning of the sixteenth Century, under James I. (I am writing for English readers) and Charles I., that the Catholic Reformation in this country obtained any sound or certain footing. In the first years of that Century, Episcopacy had been restored, but still little or nothing had been done for the restoration of public worship, until 1637, when the first attempted Liturgy (copied from the English Liturgies, so far as was consistent with the independence of *the* national character and of *a* national Church), was extinguished in its birth. Of that time to the Restoration, it is unnecessary for me to speak. In 1662, together with the Monarchy, Episcopacy was restored, but the public worship of the Church remained almost wholly Presbyterian.* The failure of the first attempt at a Prayer-Book deterred all thoughts of a second. After twenty-five years the Revolution came and found the Church still in the same state, with all the

* Skinner's History, ii. p. 467; Lathbury's History, p. 429.

work which had been done in England between the years 1549-59 yet to do. Wishful eyes were no doubt often cast upon the rejected Canons and Liturgy of 1637, but no one dared to reproduce them. God, who had so long been worshipped in the Church by Presbyterian forms, now saw good to suffer also the re-establishment of Presbyterian Discipline. It was long, however, before even this aggravated punishment was effectual to work a complete reform. The Bishops and other Clergy still conducted their ministrations after the imperfect manner of the nation among whom they dwelt. To borrow the emphatic language of Mr Cheyne—"There was no Liturgy—no Creed—no Confession, except the uncatholic one of the Scotch Reformers—no external difference between the Church and Presbytery, but the almost empty name of Bishop,"—(p. 34.) By degrees, however, in the early part of the last Century, the English Prayer-Book, which has so often proved God's especial instrument for good elsewhere, and at other times, began to find its way, for peace and blessing, into the worship of the Scottish Church.* The "Communion-office," now known as "national," which had been the distinguishing feature of the Liturgy of 1637, being copied mostly from the *first* rather than the *second* English book, was not thought of till some years afterwards.†

Such was the state of things—a gradual progress of penitential amendment under grievous and repeated chastisement—when the troubles which had arisen among the *nonjuring* Bishops and Priests in England out of proposed alterations in the English Liturgy—alterations which their independence on the civil power had set them free to introduce, and their separation from their *subscribing* Brethren inclined them, perhaps unduly, to affect and to magnify—extended to this country. Hither they naturally looked to find from the faithful in the Church, who were suffering

* Skinner's History, ii. p. 605; Lathbury's History, p. 484, 459; Cheyne's Vindication, p. 29.

† In the year 1712 the Earl of Winton reprinted the Scottish Liturgy of 1637; yet it was used only in his own Chapel at Tranent, and even then against the remonstrance of the Bishop of Edinburgh (Rose.) As long as Bishop Rose survived, the use of the English service alone was encouraged. He died in 1720.—*Lathbury's History*, p. 466. Bishop Gadderar was the first to introduce the earlier version of the Scottish Office, in his own Diocese of Aberdeen, in 1723, or soon after. We are not aware of any edition, printed with Episcopal authority, till that of 1764.—*Cheyne's Vindication*, p. 28.

the same deprivations for the same loyal cause, the sympathy they longed for, *the arbitration they needed*, and the counsel they desired; and to this they were led the more, because two of the then Scottish Bishops, Campbell and Gadderar (the latter of whom became eventually most influential in introducing the “usages,” as they were called, into this country), were, at the same time, *resident among them in England*. The first appeal of the English Nonjurors to their Scotch Brethren, for the settlement of their own intestine discords, was made in 1718. Speaking generally, the controversy between the two parties, who at length broke asunder into separate Communions,* (what a warning for ourselves!) turned upon the question of retaining the English Prayer-Book whole and unaltered, or improving upon it by changes and additions, especially in the Office for the administration of the Holy Eucharist. The advocates for alteration, in appealing to this Church, no doubt anticipated a full and cordial support to *their own course*, because *their course* was no other than that which the predecessors of the Scotch Bishops had themselves pursued, in the composition of their own Liturgy in 1637, whereby they resisted the advice of Laud, who strongly urged upon them the adoption of the then English Prayer-Book, “without variation.” But, no; taught by the sad experience of their fathers’ miscarriage, they had become more cautious. At first, at least, they declined to interfere by any act of authority, contenting themselves by recommending to both parties “peace and forbearance till people’s minds should be cleared and properly disposed for the reception of the practices” (the historian calls them the “primitive practices”) which were the subject of dispute.† Such was the moderation of Bishop Rose and Bishop Falconar—how unlike the proceedings which have characterized the present attempt to obtain sanction and acceptance for the same or similar deviations from actual use, I need not stop to point out. As yet, it appears, the Scotch Bishops *knew nothing of these points*, upon which a large, and eventually the dominant part of the English Nonjurors (but not till after Sancroft, and Turner, and Ken, and Nelson, and Dodwell, and other learned and pious men of their Communion, had either been removed by

* Lathbury’s History of the Nonjurors, p. 362.

† Skinner’s History, ii. p. 624; Lathbury’s History of the Nonjurors, p. 291.

death, or had rejoined the Established Church) laid so great a stress. I say, in 1718, the Scottish Bishops *knew nothing of these "usages,"* at least so far as their own *use* and practice was concerned. This is evident from a letter of that year, which Rose, Bishop of Edinburgh (then the senior Bishop, and the only surviving witness of ante-revolution traditions, *had there been any,* having been consecrated in 1686, and who is spoken of at this time as "managing all the affairs of the Church" *), addressed to Bishop Falconar. "As for my own part," he writes, "seeing so much stress is laid upon these usages" (*i. e.,* by the English Nonjurors), "I am very desirous of *further information.*" And his correspondent, who afterwards became one of their most strenuous advocates, writes in a letter, the same year, to the same Bishop (Rose), of "*having reason to believe* that these primitive usages were indeed apostolical," and of "*the restoration of them*" as "most desirable." Again, in 1723, "the College of Bishops" drew up a remonstrance and injunction addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Church, "exhorting and obtesting them all to shun these fatal rocks whereon *others have been shipwrecked before*; and requiring the Clergy, in particular, to forbear *the mixture* and other *obsolete usages*,† and avoid the being accessory to the breaking the peace of the Church." ‡ And again, with reference to the same period, *i. e.,* to the earlier part of the last Century, we find that "the late confusions had occasioned a number of *disorders* and *defects*, which called loudly for remedy. Among the many complaints of this kind, the *long disuse* of the sacred and apostolical rite of Confirmation gave our Bishops many uneasy thoughts." § So little likely is it that the order of Confirmation, as prescribed in this new book, however primitive and edifying, is to be referred as an *unwritten tradition* to those times!

But, between that time and the conclusion of the Century, the teaching and influence (in many ways excellent teaching and well-merited influence) of the English Nonjurors, supported as it was,

* Lawson's History, p. 522.

† The author of a MS., published by Mr Lawson, in his Appendix, p. 541, who is supposed to be Bishop Ranken, speaks of them as "rites and practices to which the Church of Scotland had been a stranger since the Reformation."

‡ Skinner's History, ii. pp. 631 and 633. Lawson's History, Appendix, pp. 528 and 540.

§ Skinner's History, ii. p. 612.

in a great measure, by the Anglo-Scotch Liturgy of 1637 (which, so far as related to the administration of Holy Communion, now *began to be revived**), produced a lasting and decided effect; moulding, together with the writings of Bishop Sage, the minds and the practice of such men as Bishop Rattray, Bishop Jolly, and “the present venerable Editor.” This effect, however, was not produced until after much most unseemly and continued struggling and confusion, which at one time (in 1727) came to an open rupture; so that the Bishops of the two parties, *Usagers* and *Anti-Usagers*, were on the point of excommunicating each other; †—again a most solemn warning to ourselves, if we have eyes to see, or ears to hear! These dissensions were composed, for a season at least, by the Concordat, or “Articles of Agreement,” between the Bishops, drawn up in 1731, the first of which is as follows:—“That we shall *only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy* in the public Divine service; nor shall we disturb the peace of the Church by introducing into the public worship any of the ancient usages concerning which there has been lately a difference amongst us; and we shall censure any of our Clergy who act otherwise.” ‡ From this it appears that the Anglo-Scottish Communion Office was *now* rising in estimation; which is to be attributed mainly, I think, to the publication of the New Service Book of the Nonjurors in England, which had appeared more than twelve years before—viz., in 1718. § I call the Office “*Anglo-Scottish*,” not as undervaluing the claims of the Scotch, who have the best right to call that *theirs* which it has been *theirs* to introduce, to improve, and, above all, to retain; but in order that Englishmen may also learn to know and feel the interest which they have in it. Anglo-Scottish, indeed, it is in a double sense, having a *two-fold English origin*—viz., from the English Book of 1549, and from the Nonjurors’ Book of 1718; and ‘a

* Not, however, till after the English Nonjurors had adopted their New Communion Office. See Lathbury, p. 465, who remarks:—“It is a well established fact, that the English Liturgy, *in all its parts*, was generally used in Scotland, without any hesitation, for several years subsequent to the (Nonjuring) Disputes in England.”

† Lawson, p. 351.

‡ Skinner, ii. p. 646, who, in a note at p. 647, explains what is *here* meant by the so-called “ancient usages,”—viz., “Immersion in Baptism, Chrism in Confirmation, and for Anointing the Sick; and a few more of that kind.”

§ Lathbury, p. 291.

two-fold Scottish adoption and improvement—viz., first in 1637; and, again, when revised more than thirty years after the period we were just now speaking of, in 1764;* by which time it would seem that the use of it had become *paramount* in the Communion of the Scottish Church. So early as 1743 it “had gained a very extensive prevalence;”† and in 1789, certain of the Bishops who were then in London, seeking to obtain the repeal of the penal laws, in their letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, speak of it as the Office “generally used.”‡ The same letter adds, “yet so far are we from making this usage a condition of Communion, that *our own Clergy have a discretionary power to use which of the two Offices they please, and some of them do actually make use of the English Office.*”

Meanwhile, to look back to the critical era of 1745, and the original enactment of these penal laws, so disgraceful to a Christian State, which forbade the Bishops and Clergy of the Scottish Orders to “assemble and meet together” with their people for the public worship of Almighty God,—in consequence of this intolerant and wicked act (1748), Congregations had been formed, and Chapels had sprung up, in a state of Schism, because not in communion with the native Bishops. These were called “English,” or “qualified,” Congregations; not that they were *really English*, for they were formed by, and for the benefit of, *Scottish* subjects, who scrupled not to take the oaths of allegiance which the State required; and they were served, *not by English Clergy*, but, as our “indigenous” historians distinctly state, by *Scotchmen*—by “numbers of young students of various professions, who went up to England”—“by young Scottish students, who felt themselves at a loss for other occupation,”§ and who were allowed to obtain

* Skinner, ii. p. 682. Cheyne’s “Scottish Office Vindicated,” p. 22.

† Cheyne, *ibid.*, pp. 30 and 25.

‡ Skinner’s *Annals*, p. 97. Lathbury, p. 480. The Bishops’ letter terms it, “the Scottish Communion Office nearly as authorized by Charles I.” Mr Cheyne represents that the use of the Office had become at this time “*universal*” (pp. 39, 40), but this does not seem consistent with the account of the Bishops, nor, perhaps, with the language of the Canon, referred to below—Since the preceding words were first published, the inference they contain has been confirmed by unquestionable authority. The venerable Bishop of Moray, &c., has informed me of two places where the English Office was in use *before the repeal of the penal laws*; and Mr Milne of Cupar has mentioned to me a *third*.

§ Skinner’s, *sen.*, *History*, ii., p. 672. Skinner’s, *jun.*, *Annals*, pp. 81, 172, 241.

English or Irish Orders, but without any claim of allegiance from the Bishops of the English or Irish Church. What could those Sister Churches have done more? It was, no doubt, an unhappy, most unhappy state of things;* but far better than the only alternative which would ordinarily present itself, viz., that such Congregations should have become Presbyterian. And this the event proved; for, in 1792, when the number of these Congregations had amounted to *twenty-two* or *twenty-four*,† and the number of those which remained faithful with their Bishops under persecution had sunk to *less than fifty*,‡ no sooner were the penal laws repealed than overtures were made for the union of the two bodies; and, before 1806, more than half of the whole number of these falsely-called English Congregations, submitting themselves to their only proper heads in the Church, were cheerfully received into membership with *their* Communion. Others have since followed their good example, forming altogether a large and most influential portion of the Church in Scotland; so that at the present time there remain in the sin of Schism, which has now become utterly inexcusable, not more than *four* or *five pseudo-Episcopal Congregations* in this country which, though really Scotch, yet bear and disgrace the name of England.

Their sin, I say, has become *utterly inexcusable*; but if any thing *could* justify or excuse it, it would be the appearance of the publication which has led me to trouble your readers, Mr Editor, with this long, but not, I am sure, unnecessary detail. All these Congregations that have been received into the Communion of the Scottish Church, have come in upon the invitation and the pledge that they were to retain the use of the Liturgy to which they had been accustomed. Praying for the Sovereign *de facto*, as they had not scrupled to do, and as we must suppose they considered it their duty to do, from their first original, they had felt no difficulty in *using* the English Prayer-Book, *whole and unaltered*. Be it remembered, their Clergy, at least at the first (as we have seen) were *Scotchmen*, whose ordination vows, though taken to English and Irish Bishops, would not bind them *contrary* to the XXth and XXXIVth of the Thirty-nine Articles; so that they *were at liberty* to use the Scottish Office, had they or their

* Skinner's Annals, Appendix, p. 557.

† Skinner's Annals, pp. 293 and 419.

‡ Ibid., p. 266. Bishop Low puts the number of Clergy at 40.

Congregations so desired. But they had not desired it, so far as I know, in any case; certainly not in general: nor, as we have seen in the letter of the Scotch Bishops in 1789, was the use of it *universaleven in the Bishops' own communion*.* The Canon of 1811, which first and for ever guaranteed to these Congregations their accustomed use as *an* authorised use of the Church in Scotland, speaks to the same effect; that the Church "hath long adopted, and *very generally*" (not *universally* or *exclusively*) "used a form for the celebration of Holy Communion, known by the name of the Scotch Communion Office." At the same time the Canon solemnly enacts (and the same has been re-enacted by General Synods again in 1828, and again in 1838) that, "as *in order to promote an union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland*, permission was lately granted † by the Bishops to retain the use of the English Office in all Congregations where the said Office had been previously in *use*, the same permission is now ratified and confirmed." What becomes of the pledge and good faith, what becomes of the truth and wisdom and charity of this Canon in the new "Book of Common Prayer," &c., which omits the English Office, and yet purports to be "according to the use of the Church of Scotland;" which would teach these Congregations to regard themselves as *tolerated aliens* rather than encourage their stricter fellowship and more cordial affection to the Communion they have joined? I must not omit to mention that the same Canon (XXI.) which pronounces the Scottish Office to be of "primary authority," and at first (in 1811) forbade its being laid aside without the authority of the "College of Bishops," now (since the revision in 1828) has empowered *each Bishop to authorise the substitution of the English form wherever he shall see occasion*.‡

Your readers will now be able, I trust, to understand why I have laid so much stress upon the ONE GREAT OMISSION of this Book; not only because the English Office is *the actual use of two-thirds* of our Congregations, and to give them a Scottish

* See note †, p. 32.

† In 1804. See "Articles of UNION proposed by the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church to those Clergymen who officiate in Scotland, by virtue of ordination from an English or an Irish Bishop."—*Appendix to Skinner's Annals*, p. 553.

‡ See Appendix (B.)

Prayer-Book which omits that use is to put “a lie in their right hand;” but also, because a large number of these Congregations *have been led to join the Church in Scotland on the Canonical compact that the English Office is a portion of its use*; and it seems to me strangely inconsistent, both with honest dealing towards those who have come in, and with prudent walking towards those who are yet without, to be guilty of an omission which virtually and implicitly ignores that compact.*

On the other hand, the INSERTIONS AND ALTERATIONS of this Book are no less objectionable on the score of prudence and charity, and, as I think I can prove, no less UNCANONICAL.

First, I maintain it is beyond the power of a single Bishop to make any alterations at all. As I have said, the public worship of the Catholic Church in this country is now settled, *serò sed seriò*. It enjoys the privilege of the English Liturgy (a privilege not once so much as hinted at in this new Book, though frankly acknowledged in the former Prayer-Book of 1637), with an Anglo-Scottish duplicate for the administration of Holy Communion, *canonically*, and *no less justly and deservedly*, pronounced to be of “primary authority” in this Church. Whatever may have been the case before the Synod of 1828, *since that time* every Bishop who has accepted the Acts of that Synod for himself and his diocese, (which all our Bishops have done), has bound himself to uniformity with the rest, *according to the present printed use*, in every ordinary act of public worship. This appears plain from THE TITLE of Canon XXVIII.,† which formerly (in 1828) stood thus,—*Pointing out the uniformity to be observed in all the parts of the Morning and Evening Service*; but in the last revision of the Canons (1838) this title was altered and expressed more generally, *On the Uniformity to be observed in Public Worship*. And still more does it appear plain from the PREAMBLE of that Canon, which runs thus: “As in *all the ordinary parts of Divine Service* it is

* See Appendix (C.)

† In the first code of 1811 it formed Canon XVI. The reader who wishes to see how necessary such a Canon had become from the previous want of uniformity, may consult the Letter of Bishop Gleig, written the year before, viz. in 1810, in which he complains to Bishop Skinner that “every man in his Diocese varied the form of the service according to his own judgment or caprice.”—*Skinner’s Annals*, p. 491; Lathbury, p. 485; also the admirable letter of the Author of the Annals, *Ibid.* p. 494.

necessary to fix, *by authority*" (*i. e.* not *Episcopal* authority, but *Canonical*, as is shown by what follows) "the precise form from which NO BISHOP" (inserted in 1838), "Presbyter or Deacon, shall be at liberty to depart, by his own alterations or insertions, lest such liberty should produce consequences destructive of 'decency and order.'" And it goes on to enact that, "in the performance of Morning and Evening Service" (and your readers will know that Morning Service is divided into what has been often called *first* and *second*, *i. e.* Communion, Service) "the words and *Rubrical directions*" (these last words were added in 1838) "of the English Liturgy shall be strictly adhered to."* In this New Book the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer remains as before; the principal alterations which it makes, occur in the Communion Office; and, therefore, to evade the applicability of the Canon to that Office, it must, as I said in my last letter, be maintained (and some, I believe, are prepared to maintain it), that Holy Communion is no part of "Public Worship," that it is no "ordinary part of Divine Service," that it is no part "of the performance of Morning Service," and that though "uniformity," and "decency and order" are necessary, in the other parts of Public Worship, they are not necessary in Holy Communion! And this, I suppose, upon the ground that we have *two forms* for that Office; as if there could not be *Uniformity* in an acknowledged and received *Biformity*; which is the very thing prescribed in Canon XXI.: "that in the use of *either the Scotch or English Office* no amalgamation, alteration, or interpolation whatever shall take place." But, in fact, the very theory itself of General Synods meeting to determine such points (as they have done in this Church since 1811) is at variance with the claim of a single Bishop to legislate in such matters for himself alone.

Next, as to the alterations themselves, which, under shelter of the evasive interpretation of Canon XXVIII., just referred to, are mainly introduced, as I have said, in the Communion Office, partly in the text, but more especially in the Rubrics.

(a) IN THE TEXT.—After the Commandments is this Rubric:—"Or, in place of rehearsing the Ten Commandments, he may, at his discretion, use the summary of the law as followeth:" (St Mark, xii. 29-31; St Matthew, xxii. 40.)

* See Appendix (D.)

This, Mr Editor, is a genuine specimen of a “venerable Scotch tradition,” as you will see from the following extracts better than from any words of my own:—“There were certain persons in our own neighbouring nation” (the English Nonjurors) “who endeavoured to revive, some time before this, some ancient usages which obtained in the Primitive Church . . . and to such a length they went, that they must strike the Decalogue out of the Liturgy, *for the Fourth Commandment, WHICH WAS JEWISH, and in place of it use that summary of the moral law delivered by our Lord, ‘Thou shalt love,’ &c.*”—*Extract from a MS., entitled “A CONTEMPORARY SKETCH OF THE STATE OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH FROM 1715 TO 1746,” published by Mr Lawson, in his Appendix, page 523.* Upon this, the editor, Mr Lawson, remarks:—“This, if correct at all, must only refer to the practice of *a few individuals*; for it *nowhere appears* that such an alteration or substitution was at any time *prevalent*, or sanctioned by authority.” The text of the manuscript itself alludes to England, but Mr Lawson, in his note, speaks evidently of this country.*

This is an example of variation. The next is one of interpolation and transposition. “*THEN shall be said the Collect for grace and strength to keep the Commandments,*” which is the second “of the Collects *to be said AFTER the Offertory*” in the English Prayer-Book.

The next example which immediately follows, is one of *permission* and variation: “*Or he MAY use one of these two Collects for the Queen,*” as in the English Prayer-Book, *only* what the Scotch Rubric permits the English commands. “Then SHALL follow,” &c.

(b.) IN THE RUBRICS.—The most important changes and additions are these. The second Rubric *prefixed* to the Office, after the words “*amended his former naughty life,*” inserts “AND RECEIVED ABSOLUTION.”

Of the Rubrics *suffixed*† to the Office, the third speaks of the Mixture as *customary*. “*It is customary to mix a little pure and clean water with the wine in the Eucharistic cup,*” &c.

“O, si sic omnia!” This is a specimen of what was really asked for (wisely or not), and what our good Bishop himself intended in this new Book. Had all been like this, only in the form of notes,

* See Appendix (E.)

† See Appendix (F.)

without alteration of the text, or omission of the English Office, the publication might have been not only innocent, but useful and valuable for the most important ends.*

The 4th Rubric *empowers* the Priest to administer, “*in cases of necessity, not otherwise, though there be BUT ONE person to communicate, with him.*”

The 5th Rubric *orders Reservation*, of which I have spoken in my last letter.

Let these NEW RUBRICS be all as wise as they are important; our present question is, are they CANONICAL? Canon XXXII. decrees that “Rules for the Order and Discipline of the Church shall be *made and enacted* by a GENERAL SYNOD ONLY; and no Law shall be *enacted, abrogated, or altered*, but by the consent and with the approbation of the majority of both Chambers.” Do not these Rubrics contain “Rules for the Order and Discipline of the Church?” Do they not assume to be NEW LAWS? Do they not speak *as such*? Are they not mixed up, and placed upon an equal footing with other Rubrics, which are received as Laws? Do they not, *some* virtually, *others* actually,—do they not ALL, VIRTUALLY OR ACTUALLY, COUNTERVAIL, ABROGATE, AND ALTER THE PRESENT EXISTING LAW?

Again: Canon XX. enacts as follows:—“For this purpose” (*i. e.* ‘that the people may the better prepare themselves for the participation of the Sacrament’) “every Clergyman *shall pay attention to the spirit and design of the Rubrics prefixed* to the order for the administration of the Lord’s Supper in the Book of Common Prayer, and shall be diligent in enforcing the duties there prescribed on all those who are committed to his pastoral charge,” &c. Now, it is certain that the English Rubric did not *design* to order private Absolution as *necessary* for Communion in any case. This we know, from the Communion-Exhortation of the first English Prayer-Book (1549), which required “such as *shall be satisfied with a general Confession* not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret Confession to the Priest.” The *prefixed* Rubric, therefore, which we have quoted, is contrary to this Canon. It is contrary, also, and so are the 4th and 5th *suffixed* Rubrics both *contrary* and *con-*

* Compare Skinner’s Annals, p. 442, where the publication of a Prayer-Book to contain *both Offices* is suggested.

tradictory, to the Canon XXVIII., before quoted, because that Canon prescribes “that, in the performance of Morning and Evening SERVICE, the words and rubrical directions of the English LITURGY shall be strictly adhered to ;” and the order *to pay attention to rubrical directions* surely does not give authority to Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, to alter them at will, to expunge or contradict them.

I forbear to notice similar alterations introduced into the other Offices.

And now, Mr Editor, I have done with the task which no seeking of my own, but the improper and incorrect publication of our late Synodical proceedings, and the public strictures on my conduct to which that publication has given rise, have imposed upon me. Only, as I fear, I must expect small thanks in some quarters for what I have done ; though I have done it, not from regard to any personal considerations, (all which would have kept me silent,) but, as I believe, for the Church’s good, and in justice to this Diocese, and, most of all, to our revered Diocesan, it is right and needful that I should guard myself, in the minds of truth-loving men, at least from *one* misrepresentation. I must not then be understood to undervalue, still less to withstand, the *use of Catholic practices*, whether derived by intermediate tradition from the English Non-jurors, or from any other source. The opposition of the “ College of Bishops ” to the “ usages,” in the earlier part of the last Century, may have been conducted on unsound and ultra-Protestant or Erastian principles ; as it was eventually met by a reaction, tending, perhaps, into the opposite extreme. I feel no sympathy with them when they condemn “ *the Mixture* and other obsolete practices.” Still less would I be thought to resist or to discourage the practice of Confession and Absolution, in the manner and to the extent in which the Church has sanctioned them ; as all who have read what I formerly published on these momentous subjects will readily believe. Least of all do I scruple at any ritual or ceremonial differences which may at present exist according to the use of the two Churches, fully sanctioned as such differences are by the 20th and 34th of the Thirty-nine Articles. No ; I readily submit myself to the judgment of the Church in all matters of this kind. I endeavour to accord my sentiments to hers, not hers to mine.

If it be the judgment of the Church in this country, *maturely and deliberately and canonically* pronounced, to alter or reject the English rubrics, or to adopt other Services, she is at full liberty to do it; and so long as the two Churches are in communion, I should not suffer myself to be greatly troubled by such differences: though when the *differences* began to amount to *contradictories*, and that, too, in matters which trench upon important doctrine, I should then think it time to look about me. But where is the *CANONICITY* for the *alterations, additions, differences, and contradictories* of this new Prayer-Book? Where, I ask, is its authority? In the name of Bishop Torrey? Had this book, indeed, been the Bishop's own work (which I *now* need scarcely tell your readers it is not*), still Bishop Torrey, when he *signed* the Canons of the Church, *resigned* his lawful authority for any such work. And if we are to suffer an orthodox Bishop to do unlawful things, how are we to prevent an heterodox Bishop from doing likewise? And if one Bishop is to have his own particular *use*, and to recommend it to his Clergy, as *the use of the whole Church*, not because it *is*, but because he thinks it *ought to be so*, why should not every other Bishop do the same, still in the name of the whole Church, upon the same arbitrary and insufficient account? Is, then, the authority of the book to be derived from its Compilers? From the two or three Clergy of this Diocese, and two or three Laymen of another, whose names and qualifications for the task are alike unknown, and who have parcelled out the preparation of it among themselves in melancholy burlesque of similar great occasions in the English Church? Is it they who are to reconcile us to this indiscreet and presumptuous trifling with the highest and most solemn interests of the Church? To the mockery of an exercise of the highest authority, which, properly speaking, belongs only to a General Synod? To the bad faith and uncharitableness which would virtually withdraw from a large portion of our Congregations that which has been expressly guaranteed to them by the Canons of the Church? To the ingratitude which would strike out the name of England from her own Book of Common Prayer, and then make it an occasion for complaining of the perfidy of English Priests? To the mischief-making which would abuse the confidence of the senior Bishop of the Church in his old age, to embroil him, not only with the Clergy of his own Diocese, but with the

* See Appendix (G.)

great majority of his Episcopal colleagues ; and, as if this were too small a matter, would cast abroad the spark of their vain traditions, to enkindle the present inflammatory tempers of our English brethren, and endanger the friendly relations of the Sister Churches one towards another ?

But I forbear. Let me only commend to them the words with which their great predecessors—the twelve Bishops and two Archbishops of the Church—concluded the preface to *their* work in 1637 :—“ Sure the public worship of God in his Church, being the most solemn action of us his poor creatures here below, ought to be performed by a liturgy *advisedly set and framed*. . . . This shall suffice *for the present*.”

Alas ! that it should not have sufficed also *for the future*.

My next letter, with your permission, will touch upon *the duties of English Churchmen towards the Church in this country*.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

Playfair-terrace, St Andrews, August 1.

P. S.—Mr L. has alleged that “ the Poverty of the Church ” alone prevented the “ Traditions,” &c., now printed for the first time, from appearing in print long ago. Skinner, the Historian, sixty years since, had represented the matter something in the same way, (vol. ii., p. 627). To this it has been replied by the writer of a temperate and able Article upon the Prayer-Book in the last number of the *Scottish Magazine*, that “ the poverty of the Bishops and Clergy ” (during the last century) “ did not prevent their being involved in perpetual *inkshed* and illimitable squabbles, and could have formed no bar to an united sanction of certain practices, had an unanimous feeling prevailed with regard to them.” This is conclusive ; but there is another answer perhaps still more to the point. Mr Lathbury informs us (p. 473) that he himself possesses copies of no less than four different editions of the English Book of Common Prayer, printed at *Edinburgh* between 1719–61. Why did not the parties for whom these Books were printed spend the same money upon as many editions—or, at least, spend *some* money upon *one* edition—of “ the Prayer-Book according to the use of the Church of Scotland ? ” Whatever prevented them, it could not have been their “ poverty.”

LETTER SIXTH.

SIR,—In continuing these communications, and extending them, as I have done, to so great a length, I have had, more especially, *two objects in view*; objects, both of which, I need scarcely say, are very different from the motive that you seemed to ascribe to me, when you declined, in my case, to make your Journal a vehicle of “personal explanations,” or unnecessary “disclosures,” and the pursuit of which appears to me so important that it readily reconciles me to the disadvantage under which I labour, when I appear before your readers *detrusus in sentinam* of your advertising columns.

The two objects of my writing to which I have alluded are these:—I have wished to make your readers, as English Churchmen, better acquainted than I fear they generally are with *our* circumstances, as Scottish Churchmen; and, in so doing, I have also wished, through the medium of comparison, to make them better acquainted (if it is not presumptuous to say so) with their own circumstances. In showing them, at the present crisis, somewhat of the peculiarities and difficulties of our situation, I have designed, if it may be, to enable them more correctly to estimate their own. Thus, I shall have fallen far short of the scope and purpose of my last letter, if it has not led its readers to conclude that it is not a *Tradition* or a *Rubric* which is at stake in the agitation of the question of this new Prayer-book, but *the Unity and Consistency, the Peace and Concord, both internal and external*, of our whole Communion. And I cannot but regard it as GRACIOUSLY PROVIDENTIAL that these troubles of ours—such as they are—*fluctus in simpulo*, compared with yours—should have occurred in *this disestablished Church*, at the very moment when the minds of many of our best and holiest brethren in England have become utterly impatient of their establishment in the State, and are all but ready to put their hands to I know not what matricidal or suicidal act which is to sever them from it. We, it is true, have not *their* occasions for impatience—very, very grievous and perplexing as I know they are—but neither have they *ours*; which, if not *so* grievous, yet are very wearying and vexa-

tious, and very prejudicial to our own spiritual life and growth in the Church. We have to contend against all the evils of the *Voluntary System*, of which you know nothing; you have to watch and fight against the evils of the *Parliamentary System*, from which we happily are exempt. You are labouring under a redundancy of restraint, we are complaining of an insufficiency of control. Your *Convocation* dares not assemble for fear of the penalties of a *præmunire* from the Crown; our *General Synod* is afraid to meet, lest some extreme consequences should ensue from its own members. Your portion is to struggle with the State, till you have won for the Church the freedom of legislative and judicial action in things spiritual, and driven back the exorbitant aggressions of the Civil Power, which tyrannically interferes with her holiest prerogatives; but *you* do not witness events which have become to *us* matters of almost everyday occurrence, and which strike at the root of unity, and order, and good government in the Church. Your connexion with the State, bad as the present conditions of it may be, saves you at least from these; it renders such disorders, which are the most *probable* things in the world to us, to you *impossible*. How would you welcome the dictation of a Vestry which forbids even to a Bishop the choice of his own assistant Curate? I say assistant *Curate*; for BISHOPS with us are CURATES too, in the original and proper signification of the name. How would you bear to see, *what we see*, the holy Liturgy of the Church edited as an ordinary book, its Rubrics altered, added to, mutilated, or expunged at will, without Episcopal or Synodical conference, and made such as to approve itself, *not to the wants and circumstances of our own Communion*, but to the liking of certain good friends, and high liturgical authorities of the Church in England! And they who act thus are the men who talk to us of Anglicising! whose only resource, when they find themselves in a minority, is to blaze abroad the matter, *after their own showing*, in the columns of the English press! The *Guardian*, the *English Churchman*, the *John Bull*, the *Ecclesiastic*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, every *Church journal and periodical in England*, must be summoned to their aid. It is true the Episcopal Synod of their own Church in Scotland disapproves of "needless publicity." It is true Diocesan Synods have passed resolutions to defend their proceedings from such unauthorised reports. But these are privi-

leged men ! These are the Church's true friends ! “ There is a *time* to speak, and a *time* to refrain from speaking,” and these men must be supposed to know better than Synods or than Bishops when that time has come. The last *Christian Remembrancer* for JULY, in an article to which I have before referred, was led to speak of the publication which had been condemned by the Bishops in APRIL as “ most *timely*,” and to express a hope that it would be universally received in the Church. “ The publication,” it says, “ *was most timely*, and the book itself most admirable ; nor must we forget to mention that its getting up reflects great credit *on the Publisher* ;” the same Mr Lendrum whom the Bishops had stigmatised as *guilty of great presumption* ; and, it adds, “ We trust that in the Diocesan Synods now soon to be held, it will be recommended as *the Prayer-Book of the Church of Scotland*.” Hitherto, the only two Diocesan Synods (so far as I know) that have taken place have not followed this advice. The Synod of Aberdeen has met, and *unanimously expressed* its “ deep regret that a book, purporting to be the Prayer-Book of the Church of Scotland, should have been issued without the authority of the Church.” The Synod of St Andrews has met—I need not tell your readers with what results. But these Synods know nothing of their own business, and if they will not do what they were told *beforehand* it was their duty to do, by THE ENGLISH PRESS, they must be soundly rated for it *afterwards*. Verily, Mr Editor, this *is* Anglicising !

But you must allow me to illustrate my present position a little more at length.

About *two years ago*, a brother Presbyter, whose name has lately appeared more than once as a correspondent in your Journal, hinted to me, in a casual conversation, that there was some intention—he did not, I think, say on the part of our Bishop—to publish a new Prayer-Book for the use of this Diocese. I at once conjured him not think of such a step ; or, at all events, not to do more than print the so-called Scottish Office in addition to the other Offices as they stand in the English book, which we at present use. I well remember that I added—*If the Rubrics are to be touched, it will convulse the Church*. The subject was dropped, and never again alluded to. Meanwhile, the Prayer-Book is printing silently and unostentatiously ; is at length heard

of as ready to be issued ; is seen and examined by the Bishops ; is condemned as “ an instance of high presumption ; ” is ordered to be suppressed. Soon after, the Synod of this Diocese meets ; the Clergy are dismayed at the tidings of a new Prayer-Book (which some of them, *to that day, had neither seen nor heard of*), edited with their Bishop’s name, recommended to their own use, and, *notwithstanding its condemnation*, already in use in some quarters of the Diocese ; *my own “ conduct,”* of which before “ some hopes ” had been entertained, *becomes, in the judgment of this same Presbyter, unsatisfactory* (though I was only doing what *two years before* I had given him the fullest reason to suppose I should feel it my duty to do) ;—the Church in England is appealed to, to witness, on the one hand, her poor persecuted Sister, betrayed by English Priests ; and, on the other hand, the glorious spectacle of “ Mr Lendrum and his employers,” undismayed by Episcopal censure, and standing forth to challenge the honours of a good confession in a holy cause ! “ Si fractus illabatur orbis, Impavidos ferient ruinæ.” *The convulsion which was foreseen and foretold, has come ;* and the authors of it are to be the last persons in the world to bear any portion of the blame !

But, Sir, let me not deceive you. I *am* an Angliciser. I am too thankful to the Bishops and other great Divines of the English Convocation who composed and reviewed our Liturgy and Rubrics to suffer (if I can well help it) their time-honoured work to be tampered with by any authority not equivalent to their own. I cannot tell what other English Churchmen may think of this, but I confess it moves me to impatience that the Book of Common Prayer, of which the Scottish Bishops, who were in London in 1789, pronounced,—“ We believe it, in our hearts, to be the best composed Liturgy in the world ; ”* and which, again, in an Address to the King, in 1802, *the whole Church in this country* professed itself “ to use with thankfulness,” and “ ever to have looked upon as *the stay and bulwark of the Reformation*,”†—that this Book should now be treated so rudely and unceremoniously under a mere shadow of authority, such as that which is quoted for “ Mr Lendrum and his employers.” And my impatience on this account is shared, I am persuaded, by the vast majority of Clergy and

* Skinner’s Annals, p. 97.

† Ibid. p. 299.

Laity in this Church, who, I doubt not, would all speak of the same Book in the same language at the present day.

Yes, *I am an Angliciser* in this sense; but I am not, therefore, the less a *Scottish Churchman* too. I am thankful for the privilege which I enjoy in the use of the national Communion Office; and I venture to think that others would do well to be thankful for it likewise. But I am not, therefore, prepared to put a Prayer-Book into the hands of such as may think otherwise, and say to them rudely,—“Here is the use of the Scottish Church,” when it does not contain the Communion Office, which, as *bonâ fide* members of the Scottish Church, they have been used to all their lives. I cannot see any good that is to be gained, though I can see abundance of evil that may ensue, from such a proceeding. It is, therefore, as a *Scottish Churchman*, mainly, that *I repudiate this Book*. It is also as a *Scottish Churchman* that, having now, for upwards of three years, enjoyed some experience and opportunities of observation, I shall take upon me (which I trust I may without much presumption) to explain to our Brethren in England what I conceive to be the true and actual position of the Church in this country; and then beg them to compare the view I shall have set before them with the representations they may have received from other quarters.

In the first place, then, it appears to me that we are not in a state to be making experiments with *new Rubrics* or *bygone Traditions*, when our use of what we already have in the English Prayer-Book, and our own Eucharistic office (which already embodies the most important “usages,” for which the Non-jurors contended in the last century*), is so very imperfect; when our public offering of the daily worship of the Church is as yet so scanty; when weekly Communion is almost unknown; when the observance of Fasts and Festivals is rarely recognized; when the use of our national Communion Office is continually losing ground; and this last, owing *not* to the perfidy of English priests, *but to causes far more simple and uncontrollable*, namely, the union and daily increasing communication between the two countries; the spread of mutual good will, increased by facilities of mutual intercourse; the partial residence of so many of our upper classes in England; *their education, hitherto, almost wholly received in Eng-*

* See Skinner's History, ii., p. 623.

land; and the transfer of many large properties in the country into English hands. Under these circumstances, unless we are to court schism and disunion, our only true wisdom is to learn to use and to value what we already have; and which, *if we do use*, we shall find ourselves sufficiently distinguished from the fellow-Christians among whom we dwell, without seeking for further distinctions to separate us more widely than need be. Your readers have been told of a "Scottish system," and "of a considerable number of English Priests who are trying faithfully to work it out." And another correspondent has complained to you of "an emasculated Anglicanism infused into the Church; *English rites and usages, the merest dry bones of orthodoxy*." Now what, in simple truth, is the meaning of all this? Shall I remind you of Mr Cheyne's description of an *emasculated Scotticism*, "without Liturgy, without creed, without confession;" until, at length, by the blessing of God, the English Prayer-Book was introduced into this Church? Or, shall I say that I am utterly at a loss to discover *of what* this Scottish system consists; or *where* it is to be found? Shall I assert that the system which these English Priests are faithfully working out, so far as they *are* working faithfully, *is*, and *can be*, no other than the English system? And shall I not say that it is *grossly ungrateful and untrue* thus to attempt to make Churchmen in England discontented with their own system, by preferring to it another, which yet is *not another*, save only in the felonious substitution of another name? Carelessness, and worldliness, and frowardness, and insubordination, *will emasculate any system*; and it would be too much to hope that there will ever cease to be careless and worldly Ministers, and froward and insubordinate Laymen in both Churches. Parliaments on a large scale, and Vestries on a small, will cramp the energies of the best regulated Communions; and a system that shall know nothing of the evils of Erastianism on the one hand, or of Voluntaryism on the other, is *not for this world*. But what has all this to do with the new Prayer-Book? These worthy English Priests, who were working so faithfully before, did not require Laws and Canons, Order and Unity, Truth and Charity, all to be set at nought and trampled under foot, *to enable them to do so still*.

The fact is, Sir, as you might expect from the historical sketch which I exhibited to your readers in my last letter—the fact is, *the foundations of an effectual Church system in this country are*

yet to lay. Our excellent Church Society, almost the only instrument that we have, has *done*, and is *doing much*, especially in eking out the miserably-disgraceful incomes of our impoverished Clergy. But still, with no certain endowments provided for our Bishops, nor—with one or two noble exceptions, for which individual Laymen are to be thanked—for our other Clergy; with very few residences erected for their reception; with our Churches and *advowsons* almost invariably in the hands of Lay Vestries; with very few Schools; with no training for our Masters until three months ago, when our first attempt was made to supply that want (mainly through the exertions of the excellent Bishop of Glasgow, who knows well “where the faithful working of the Scottish system” is to *begin*;) with little of the beauty of holiness in our public ministrations; with very little hold, as yet gained, upon the Rich—little or no hold upon the Poor—little or no hold upon the Middle Classes; with no fixed or *Parochial* distribution of our respective Flocks;—under all these circumstances, it is not, I think, too much to say, that the *very foundations of an effectual Church system in this country are yet to be laid.* And, may I not add, I earnestly hope and trust that TRINITY COLLEGE, the only seminary which we have for the training of the Youth of our more influential Members, and for the professional instruction and preparation of our Clergy (whether or no the present Warden and his Assistants may suffice for so great a work), will, by the blessing of God, *do much* to lay them.

Such, then, is our state. And, in such a state, what would you say should be *our first object* to pursue? Surely, *to improve our hold upon our people*, so far as possible, without the sacrifice of principle; to inspire them with confidence in the rectitude of our intentions, and the prudence of our undertakings; to deal fairly and frankly by them; to convince them practically of the superiority of the Episcopal system, as in other ways, so especially in this, for which St Jerome says it was introduced—the avoidance of all schism, of all insubordination, of all dissension—to act the part of the good Centurion, “as men under authority” (not, indeed, the authority of the State, but the authority of our own Synods, Canons, Rubrics, Laws), “having soldiers under us,” if we are to claim *their* allegiance; not to *play*, as it were, *at hide and seek* with our Bishops in the publication of the Book of Common

Prayer (as the date upon the title-page will show has been done in the present case;)-not to go out of our respective Dioceses to agitate what are notoriously deprecated as party schemes; not to appeal to London Newspapers when we find ourselves out-voted, for the adjustment of our supposed wrongs; no, nor when English Churchmen are writhing under the infliction of a sentence which they disown almost as universally as Scottish Churchmen do the publication of this new book, to take occasion to boast ourselves in the superior excellency of our "Scottish system," and striking the name of the *Church of England* out of her own *Book of Common Prayer*, to seem to say, with singular ill-grace in the hour of her affliction,—

". . . . resigno quæ dedit; et meâ
Virtute me involvo, probamque
Pauperiem sine dote quaero."

And yet, Mr Editor, I write as a *Scottish Churchman*. I write as one who would never consent to sacrifice one *iota* of the independence of the National Church, inestimable as it is on other accounts, and especially as a separate and distinct Witness for Catholic Truth. Only let us know and understand well *wherein this Nationality consists*. It does not consist in the use of *this* or *that* Communion Office, nor in the revival of *this* or *that* Tradition, considering how little we have had to do, *originally*, with any of these. Whatever we have borrowed from England, whether in the last or preceding Century, we are at liberty when we choose to return, or to abandon; though we shall not, I think, consult our own best interests (any more than the Church of England did in 1552) when we choose to abandon that which is more Primitive and Catholic in favour of that which is less so. The Nationality of our Church, however, does not consist in either the use or disuse of any such forms. But it consists in the *independence of her Ecclesiastical polity*. It consists in the free and unfettered exercise of her legislative and judicial functions. It consists in the sober, wise, and harmonious action of her General, Episcopal, Diocesan Synods. It consists in the pure and uncontrolled election of her Bishops. And, of all the solemn duties which this Polity has in view, I suppose there is *no one more vital and important than that of consolidating the combined force of which our Communion is composed*. Our wisdom, in this respect, is not surely to complain of "downward tendencies," or of the wrong

we suffer when our Church is “brought down to the English level,” nor to indulge in the silly taunt of “Anglicising,” nor to represent “that the tradition of the Scottish Church has been gradually encroached upon by Anglicism;” but to regard our Communion *such as she really is*—such as *her own Acts and Synods have made her*—yes I repeat, *SUCH AS SHE REALLY IS*; and not such as a few amongst us—no matter at what expense of Truth or Charity—may choose to represent her, or may fancy that *SHE OUGHT TO BE*. If it be so, that “two Nations are in her womb,” now happily united under one political sway, this is God’s WORK; and OUR WISDOM again will be to deal *impartially* with our own Members in such a case. And as this is our wisdom, so our true dignity lies not in representing our connexion with England as a danger and disgrace, rather than a benefit, but in the grateful acknowledgment of her claims, while we vindicate our own.

It is not long ago that Bishops of this Church were confirmed by the Episcopal College in their election, only *upon the condition* that they would “strenuously recommend, by their own practice, and by every other means in their power, the use of the Scottish Office.” This was the case with my own venerable Diocesan; and I do not scruple to mention the fact, not only because it has now become matter of Ecclesiastical History, and the document he signed has been faithfully preserved and recorded,* but also because he himself, I have no doubt, still regards the deed with the same entire self-approbation and satisfaction with which he made it. But I very much doubt whether the practice of binding a Bishop by *a written pledge* to the performance of his supposed duty (over and above the pledges which he makes in the face of the whole church), will quite approve itself to the notions of a pure unfettered Episcopacy which are entertained in England. However this may be, the practice was of short continuance, and, like all such party-spirited and irregular proceedings, it appears to have defeated its own end. Other examples of a like kind, but still more unseemly and objectionable, are to be found in the history of the Church during the last century; which, in fact, presents little more than a continued series of struggles between the two parties in our Communion, either endeavouring to over-

* Skinner’s Annals, p. 475.

reach the other by expedients not always consistent with a nice regard for Christian principle. The publication of this new Prayer-Book, as it is the *wildest*, and the *boldest*, so let us hope it is the *last* exhibition of such a spirit.

We may *well hope so* ; for, indeed, we do ourselves grievous wrong by such proceedings. Not only do they distance Neighbours, and estrange Friends, and alienate brother Christians, and sorely let and hinder our running the race that is set before us, but THE WHOLE CHURCH is held responsible, and suffers from the indiscretion which it disapproves of and condemns. A single rash and ill-advised undertaking proves the death-warrant of many wise ones. It emboldens evil, and discourages good. Men's sympathies and interests having been betrayed in a wrong or needless cause, they become suspicious or impatient of such as are right and needful. The *many timid* are deterred by the alarm, the *many lukewarm* take shelter in the excuse, of a miscarriage which is owing only to the rashness of a few. Churchmen are hampered and distracted between the duty of resistance to what they judge to be inexpedient, and the desire not to separate themselves from those whom they see to be zealous, and would fain believe to be well-meaning men ; till, at length, the former duty is imposed on them with a weight which preponderates in the scale, and mutual disappointment and mistrust ensues. And when we look to the particular scheme which has given rise to these remarks, the matter becomes still more serious. To mix up *invalid rubrics with the valid is to sap the very foundation of Ecclesiastical law*. Of this we have an example in the so-called Apostolical Canons, the whole body of which is vitiated by the spurious admixtures that are found among them. We have another example of the same kind in the frauds which have been practised by the Roman Canonists in their spurious Decretals through a similar process. The editors of this Book had no such design ; but they have approached nearer than they were aware to one of the foulest blots that must ever attach to members of the Romish Communion—the *arbitrary alteration, suppression, and interpolation* of the laws and other documents of the Church.

And now, Mr Editor, I trust I shall not altogether have failed in the objects I have had in view in these communications. I

would fain hope I may have led at least a portion of your readers to ponder over their own position as English Churchmen in a different and (God grant!) less disconsolate frame of mind than that in which some, I know, have been lately tempted to regard it. I have endeavoured to show them how other evils may befall a Church—evils, too, very difficult to redress—besides those which arise from State tyranny and Parliamentary usurpation. I have had in view to remind them, that if they lose something of *independence* by State connection, they also gain something of *stability*, which they have not, perhaps, been accustomed to recognize with the gratitude it deserves; that the disestablishment of a Church is no security for perfect order, nor the free election of Bishops a sufficient guarantee for the absence of all pledges, or the impossibility of party spirit; and whereas it will be agreed on all hands that Synodical Legislation is essential to a Church's well-being and never more so than at the present moment in England, it may meanwhile be some little comfort to them—sorry comfort, I admit, at the best—to reflect that, by this very privilege, wherein you are *cruelly starved*, we are apt to be *surfeited*. Certain it is, your trials are infinitely greater, in proportion to the GRANDEUR OF YOUR POSITION and your opportunities for good; a position and opportunities which, as they leave you no occasion, so they should offer you no temptation, to cast an eye of envy or of preference upon any other Communion in the Christian world.

And, with regard to the other object I had in view, I also hope I may have done something to point out the way in which our Brethren in England may best assist us. I have mentioned especially our CHURCH SOCIETY, and our total most lamentable WANT OF CLERICAL ENDOWMENTS, which this admirable Society does its best to remedy. And if there be one FACT more than another which I would wish to leave impressed upon the minds of English readers, *it is this*: The State-establishment System (great as may be its evils when mal-administered) *does not, cannot*, under any circumstances, *leave out the poor*; while the Voluntary System, more especially where it is in the hands of the Upper Classes, as in this country, *has a direct tendency to do this*. The Presbyterian Establishment has kept its hold upon the Middle and Lower Orders, and *will continue to keep it, until we have placed our*

Bishops and other Clergy in a condition of independence, such as may enable them to deliver their commission boldly, to “charge them that are rich in this world, that they be rich in good works ;” and such, at the same time, as may set them more at liberty, *by giving them the means*, to consult the wants and interests, both spiritual and temporal, of their poorer Brethren. Hence, in the present condition of the Church, it will be evident that the remedies and appliances, most suitable for England, are not our remedies. Schemes that would highly approve themselves to you are (to speak plainly) *mere moonshine* for us. An increase of Clergy, of *less means* and *lower attainments*, may be highly valuable and indispensable for you ; we require Clergy of *more means*, and (no disparagement to many excellent men who have made the most of limited opportunities) of *higher attainments* ; if they are to cope with the Upper Classes who, for the most part, are *nominally* ours ; if they are to influence them for the common good, and *for the extension of our Communion*, as they ought to do. Under these circumstances, it will assist us little to tantalise us with *fancy designs*, for which we are not prepared ; which represent the spiritual condition and necessities of England rather than our own ; and which therefore find, it may be, a ready appreciation in England, but none in the place for which they are proposed. To deal thus with us is to treat us like Children who are impatient for the *second course* of their entertainment before they have received the *first*. Above all, you must not throw us into a state of needless antagonism with our Rich, upon whom, humanly speaking, the efficiency of our Church depends ; nor, again, throw *them* into a state of unnecessary separation from the Poor, who *ought* to look to them for examples ; no, not even should you be prepared to do for us, *in their stead*, all that we require :—this is TO MAR ALL OUR WORK ; and to make the mysterious dispensation of ALMIGHTY GOD, who has knit them together for mutual blessing and support, of *none effect*.

These, then, are the matters, Mr Editor, whith I desired to lay before your readers. If they tend to make the position and the wants of the Church in this country better understood, I shall not altogether regret the occasion which has given rise to them. If I am mistaken in the facts and statements which I have advan-

ced, I trust I shall not be unwilling to receive correction. And to any Churchman, *English* or *Scotch*, who is disposed to give the subject the attention it deserves, I am prepared to repeat the well-known words—

“ Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti ; si non, HIS UTERE MECUM.”

I am,

SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

Playfair Terrace, St Andrews,
August 9, 1850.

P.S.—Since the above letter was written, another Synod of the Church has met—the Diocesan Synod of Brechin—and condemned the publication of the book to which my letters have referred.

C. W.

August 10.

LETTER SEVENTH.

SIR,—I beg you to insert the accompanying document in your next Paper.

I see nothing in the letter of your correspondent, G. H. F., that throws any new light upon the controversy, or that requires an answer,* except *a mis-statement of fact*, which, as it appears now for the *second* time, (the *first* time being put forth in connexion with the name of the Bishop of Brechin, I forbore to notice it, see *Guardian*, No. 236, p. 498,) I feel it my duty to point out.

* See Appendix (H.)

G. H. F. has stated that the petition to our Bishop to edit a New Prayer-Book proceeded from "*a majority* of his Clergy." In 1847, when the petition was presented, there were *seventeen* Clergymen in the Diocese. The petition was signed by *seven*. Of these seven, *two* have voted against the Book as being entirely different from what they had intended. A *third* has since left the country.

Since my last communication another Synod has met,—the Diocesan Synod of Glasgow,—and has condemned the new Prayer-Book by a majority of eleven to three.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

St Andrews, August 23.

*To the Right Rev. PATRICK TORRY, D.D., Bishop of St Andrews,
Dunkeld, and Dunblane.*

We, the undersigned Presbyters of your Lordship's Diocese, with every feeling of respect and veneration for your Holy and Apostolic office and character, beg leave to present to you the following Statement, with the Petition founded thereupon; heartily thanking ALMIGHTY GOD that it hath pleased Him to reserve to you, at your present advanced age, the faculties of your mind unimpaired, and praying Him still to enable you to use them, as they have been used hitherto, for the welfare and well-ordering of your Diocese.

Your Lordship has been pleased to recommend to our use an edition of the Book of Common Prayer.

Every recommendation of our Bishop is entitled to receive from us the most respectful consideration, and in a matter of this kind, relating to the Order of Public Worship (provided it be consistent with our obligations to higher authorities), to carry with it even the force of a command.

It grieves us, therefore, to think that in this instance we are not only unable to adopt your recommendation, but feel it our duty respectfully to protest against it; and that for these reasons:—

FIRSTLY, Because the Book which you recommend *purports* in its *Title-Page* to be “The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, according to the use of the Church of Scotland.”

Upon this, we beg leave to submit to your Lordship :—

- (1.) That to speak of the use of a National Church otherwise than as it *actually exists*, is beyond the power of a single Diocesan in that Church, without the consent and advice of his Episcopal Brethren.
- (2.) That a Bishop who so speaks seems to us to be guilty of the same offence towards his com-provincial Brethren as the Bishop of Rome, who sets himself up to be *Episcopus Episcoporum*.
- (3.) That this edition of the Book of Common Prayer does not only speak of, but prescribes and *orders*, in several important particulars, a use which is *actually*, and *notoriously*, and *advisedly*, not the existing use of other Dioceses and Bishops, and of the great proportion of the Church in this country.
- (4.) That thus to “interfere” with your Episcopal Brethren is not only at variance with the first principles of unity, and charity, and good government in the Church, but directly contrary to the Canons of the Church Universal, and to the 37th *Canon* of our own Scottish Code in particular.
- (5.) That in several respects this Book is not according to the prevailing use even of your own Diocese; and we are persuaded it cannot be your serious intention to recommend us now to change the forms and usages to which our people have been accustomed, and which, during the long period of your Episcopate, you have sanctioned hitherto, in order to introduce others which they have never known, and the most important of which, in more cases than one, your Lordship has formally consented they were not to use.
- (6.) That this is a grievance of which we cannot but complain, that you should have seen fit to recommend to us, with the full weight of your Episcopal authority, that which, in the instances alluded to, it would be contrary to express compact with our people, to attempt to introduce; and, in every instance where the Clergy do not adopt this Book, to represent us in the eyes of our people, as withstanding the recommendation of our Diocesan, and as following some other use than that which is now *for the first time* alleged to be *the use of the Church* in which we minister.
- (7.) That for a single Bishop *ex arbitrio* to assume the general but

short-lived practice of a particular period, because it has happened to fall in part within his own experience, and to denominate that practice as *the use of the Church*, when it has long since *ceased to be so*, is a measure, as it appears to us, unwarrantable in itself, and liable to be fraught with very dangerous consequences.

On these accounts, *firstly*, we humbly hope you will not persist in a recommendation which appears to us to be plainly contrary to unity and truth : to *unity*, because by it you interfere with the Use and Jurisdiction of other Bishops ; to *truth*, because by it you represent the Use both of your own Diocese, and of theirs, as other than it really *is*, or *can be*, consistently with deeds and compacts of the most solemn kind.

SECONDLY. We beseech your Lordship to withdraw your recommendation of this Book, because it *contains* several important NEW LAWS ; thereby directly disobeying the Canon of the Church, which decrees that “ Rules for the Order and Discipline of the Church shall be made and enacted by a General Synod only ; and no Law shall be enacted, abrogated, or altered, but by the consent and with the approbation of the majority of both Chambers.”—(Canon xxxii.)

Upon this we have to remark :—

- (1.) That although, in other ages and circumstances of the Church, it has been competent for single Bishops, in putting forth Formularies to be used in the worship of their own Flocks, to prescribe the Order for their Use ; and although this may have been permitted and practised in our own Church, down even to so recent a period as the commencement of your Lordship’s own ministry, yet *this is not now the case* ; since every Bishop of our Communion, and your Lordship with the rest, has bound himself and his Diocese to the Principles and Laws laid down for the regulation of this matter by the General Synods of the whole Church ;—the Synod of Aberdeen in 1811, of Laurencekirk in 1828, and of Edinburgh in 1838.
- (2.) That, whereas our *Canon* xxviii. acknowledges in its Title the principle of “ Uniformity in Public Worship ;” and asserts in its Preamble, that “ in all the ordinary parts of Divine Service it is necessary to fix, BY AUTHORITY, the precise form, from which NO BISHOP, Presbyter, or Deacon, shall be at liberty to depart ;” and whereas *Canon* xxi. further enacts, that “ in the Use of either

the Scotch or English Office, no amalgamation, alteration, or interpolation whatever shall take place ;” this Book, notwithstanding, does alter and interpolate the most solemn part of Divine Service, namely, the Order for the Administration of Holy Communion, in several ways, which no received copy of either the Scotch or English Office has warranted hitherto.

- (3.) That, whereas *Canon xxxii.*, above quoted, forbids rules to be made for the Order of the Church except by a General Synod ; and whereas *Canon xxviii.* further decrees, that “in the performance of Morning Service” (under which term we apprehend that the Administration of Holy Communion has always been included), “the Rubrical directions of the English Liturgy shall be strictly adhered to ;” and whereas *Canon xx.* commands that “every Clergyman shall pay attention to the spirit and design of the Rubrics prefixed to the Order of the Administration of the Lord’s Supper in the Book of Common Prayer ;” this Book, notwithstanding, adds to, alters, suppresses, interpolates, and even contradicts those Rubrics in several important particulars, all which we are prepared to point out to your Lordship, whenever you shall be pleased to invite or permit us so to do.

On these accounts, therefore, *secondly*, we humbly hope that you will not persist in your recommendation of this Book, containing, as it does, sundry matters which it is *inconsistent with canonical obedience*, either for you to issue, or for us to receive.

THIRDLY. We cannot, in our consciences, accept the recommendation of this Book, because *the publication of it*, as it is, *is not*, in our opinion, *agreeable to good faith*.

Upon this, your Lordship, we trust, will allow us to remark :—

- (1.) It is contrary to the *good faith which we owe to our Civil Governors*, who would never have relieved us from penal disabilities, as was done in 1792, could they have anticipated, that in the title of the very first Prayer-Book we were to print for the use of our Communion, we should assume to ourselves the precise denomination which the law (whether rightfully or not) confers only on the Presbyterian Establishment.
- (2.) It is contrary to the *good faith which we owe to the Authorities of the Church in England*, who would never have assisted us, as they did, to the removal of the same penal laws, except upon the understanding that in *using* the Prayer-Book of the sister Church

as our own (which we then professed ourselves to do*), we should not *abuse* it ; that we should not feel ourselves at liberty to alter or *contradict* it, so as to disturb the consciences, and weaken the allegiance of her own members. We are, indeed, far from questioning the full right of our own Church to make variations from the English Liturgy, and, in fact, to introduce whatever Use and Order she pleases, into the performance of her Public Worship ; but this is a right which we are persuaded ought to be exercised with the greatest delicacy and caution in the present circumstances of both Churches, and only with the advice and sanction of the united wisdom and authority of our whole Communion ; as provided for in *Canon xxxii.* above quoted.

- (3.) It is contrary to the *good faith which we owe to a very large portion of our own members*, to whom, not only the solemn promises of the Bishops, in 1804, but the Synodical enactment of 1811, guaranteed the recognition of the English Communion Office as part of the *received Canonical Use* of the Church in Scotland, in order to bring about the reunion of the Church, then so much desired ; which Office, nevertheless, as regards the administration of that Sacrament, is altogether omitted from this new Book.

On these accounts, therefore, *thirdly*, we cannot conscientiously accept the recommendation of a Book, which carries, at least, *the appearance of bad faith* towards the parties who have most claim to be treated by us with charity and respect, viz., our Governors in the State, the Church of England, and the reunited Members of our own Body.

FOURTHLY. We beseech you to withdraw from us the recommendation of this Book, because it is very different from the publication which was asked for by a minority only of your Clergy, and very different from what some of them when they *made*, and you yourself, as it appears, when you *acceded* to that request, could have intended it to be.

Upon this we have to observe—

- (1.) That there appears to have been an entire misunderstanding between your Lordship and the compilers of this new book, with respect to the very *first principle* upon which it was to be prepared.

* Skinner's Annals, p. 97.

- (2.) That your Lordship, it would seem, had no intention of doing, or authorising to be done, more than you were requested, namely, to “ edit such a book as would serve as a document of reference and authority in regard to the practice of the Church ;” *authority*, namely, *such as* “ the *attestation* of a Prelate of your Lordship’s age and experience ” could give to the “ Liturgy and usages of the Church during the last century.”
- (3.) That this could only properly and lawfully be done, not by meddling with Texts and Rubrics of our Services as they have been received hitherto, or by omitting any portion of the authorised Offices and Liturgy of the Church ; but simply, in the way of additional notes and explanations, and by incorporating the Communion Office, which is of primary authority in our Church, into the body of our other Formularies.
- (4.) That what, however, has actually been done, is altogether different from this : one Office has been introduced, not in addition to, but to the exclusion of the other ; and instead of the Order and Rubrics of the Prayer-Book remaining as they were, many changes have been introduced, all more or less to the detriment of the Church’s own Law, as it before stood, and at the same time purporting to be of equal and the same authority with that Law ; thus weakening and confounding, in the minds of Churchmen, the obligation of *all our Law*.
- (5.) That the men who have so acted appear to us to have abused the confidence you reposed in them ; that whereas your Lordship had no intention of acting otherwise than legally, canonically, consistently, and faithfully, they have made you to appear to act in a way the reverse of all these :—*illegally*, towards the State ; *uncanonically*, towards the Church ; *inconsistently*, with your own practice ; *faithlessly and uncharitably*, in the relation in which you stand to us, and to a large proportion of the Laity of your Flock.

Upon all these accounts, and because we consider it our especial duty and privilege, under the circumstances of age and infirmity, and of distance from us, in which your Lordship is at present placed, to support and defend our Bishop when the occasion may appear to call for it (and such occasion did seem to us to have arisen, when we found you placed in direct collision with the EPISCOPAL SYNOD, *as expressed in their Resolution, emanating from a great majority of your Brethren*), we are bold to beseech you, if you cannot at once consent to withdraw your re-

commendation of this Book, and forbid its use, at least to take further and better counsel in this matter.

In the meantime, we beg you to be assured that we should not have used this freedom, either now or in the discussions of our late Synod, if we had not felt persuaded (whether rightly or wrongly, we will not presume to say) that this Book is much more the work of others than your own; and so far from treating your just prerogative and canonical authority over us with disrespect, we humbly conceive that we have been engaged in maintaining both, and shall still hope to rescue them from the danger into which they have been brought by others, who, by presuming upon and misusing them, have incurred not only the condemnation of the Episcopal Synod, but the strong and very general reprobation of the Church at large; the peace and unity of which have been brought into danger by their boldness and indiscretion.

Should your Lordship, as we humbly hope, be prevailed upon, from these considerations, to give your consent to this Petition, we shall gladly consent to the withdrawal of our recent Resolutions from the Diocesan Record, with the sincerest expressions of concern and regret, that from the unavoidable absence of your Lordship, and from the perplexing and unprecedented circumstances in which the Synod was then placed, it should ever have been our duty to adopt such a course. We call those circumstances *unprecedented*, because we believe it is without a parallel in the history of Christendom, that a Bishop of a Church, which has adopted, and carries on the practice of Annual Diocesan Synods, should have consented to issue a new Book of Common Prayer without any counsel or communication with his own Synod, *either before or since the publication*; and that a single Bishop of a National Church, which observes the practice of Annual Episcopal Synods, should issue such a Book, bearing the name of the whole Church, *without the consent or advice of his Episcopal Brethren*; who, even if they had no Law or Canon to authorize them in condemning such a step (though we humbly conceive they have had both), could not but do as they have done, upon the simplest principles of self-defence.

Humbly praying ALMIGHTY GOD to bless and keep you, and to move your heart to grant the Prayer of this Petition, should the statement it contains be such as to approve itself to your mature reflection,

We are, with all respect and duty, your Lordship's faithful Presbyters and Servants in CHRIST,

GEORGE G. MILNE.

CHARLES J. LYON.

JOHN TORRY.

NORMAN JOHNSON.

WILLIAM TAYLOR.

HENRY MALCOLM.

GEORGE WOOD.

CHARLES WORDSWORTH.

THOMAS WILDMAN.

WILLIAM BRUCE.

JOHN P. ALLEY.

WILLIAM BLATCH.

APPENDIX.

(A.)

“ THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,” p. 13.

It has been supposed, in more quarters than one, that I concede the above *as a rightful title* to the Presbyterian Establishment. If I may be allowed to know my own sentiments, it would be difficult to conceive a greater mistake. It is true, I have spoken of it as “ the legal Title” of the Establishment ; and in the Memorial of the Twelve Clergy of the Diocese, it is regarded as *contrary to good faith towards our Civil Governors*, to “ assume to ourselves the precise denomination which the Law (whether rightfully or not) confers only on the Presbyterian Establishment.” The value of this statement must depend, not upon any consequences which it may seem to involve, but upon *historical fact*. No good man will wish to gain any thing by dishonesty or evasion of the truth. And a zealous Churchman, I venture to think (if he is to do any good), must begin like his neighbours by the somewhat homely process of being an honest and a truthful man. Any one who wishes to know what passed between *the State and our Communion* in 1792 should read *Skinner’s Annals* for that year. Nor is there, I think, the least occasion for a dutiful-minded Scottish Churchman, however zealous, to disavow and repudiate the acts of the Scottish Bishops at that time.

My real meaning then is this. In declining the above Title, as I have done, for our own Communion, I do not therefore concede it to another. And the main reason why I decline it for ourselves is to be found in Matthew, vii. 6, x. 13, 14 ; Luke, x. 10, 11, and other similar Texts. When Scotland, *as a Nation*, gives herself to the true Body of the Church, and not to an imperfect form of it—then, and not till then, in my opinion, can the Church, except by a misnomer, be called *hers*. Twice she has, as a Nation, rejected the Church—and still, if

we offer to her "THE PEARL," she will "turn again and rend" us. Meanwhile the Church subsists, though not *of her*, yet *in her*. It has been said, that "as Christ is the Saviour even of those who reject Him, so is the Church, the Church of all men, even of those who reject her." And there is a mixture of truth in this, but *more error*, when applied, as it has been, in the present case. For as Christ can never be the Saviour of Antichrist, so neither can the Church be properly called, in this point of view, the Church of a Nation which has not only rejected her, but *set up another in her stead*. See Hosea, iii. 3.

On the other hand, respect for HUMAN LAW alone, would never induce me to *give* the Title where it is not *divinely* due. But it would be *one reason* to prevent me from assuming it, when Truth and the DIVINE LAW are better satisfied (as I think) by another Title, viz. "the Church IN Scotland."

To repeat, then, what I have said, for the matter is important. The Church is *in* Scotland; but Scotland, as a nation, disowns the Church; and to call it *hers*, or *of her*, when she disowns it and *supplies its place* by another Form of Communion, can only tend to confusion, unreality, and unnecessary offence.

If I were writing for the sake of controversy, I should beg to remind the Author of a recent letter to the *Guardian* that "Protestant Episcopal Church" was the Title given to our Communion (not by Parliament only, but) by THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH in 1828 (see the Title of "the Code of Canons" in that year, *Canon XXVI. and passim*), and that the Title "Church of Scotland" has NEVER BEEN ASSUMED BY THE CHURCH HERSELF in *any* Canon of *any* Council, or on *any* occasion.* Not being a Scotchman "by parentage, birth, and education, by Baptism, Confirmation, and double Ordination," it does not become *me* to go beyond CANONS and COUNCILS. At the same time, I have never used the former Title, nor is it probable that I ever shall use it.

(B.)

ON CANON XXI., p. 34.

No one who is really seeking Truth will desire to quote this Canon without reference to the change which it has undergone, and to the

* And yet—so *difficult* is it to speak the truth—G. H. F. asserts that "we have all along, both before and since the repeal of the Penal Laws, used *this* as our PROPER designation!"

virtual inconsistency of its two main provisions respecting the use and authority of the two Communion Offices. The fact is, it holds the same place in our Synodical Legislation that Belgium does upon the Continent of Europe. It is the battle-field of the Church, and it bears evident marks of the victory of both parties. Each has given way, in turn, to gain, as it reckoned, its own point more securely. The retaining for the "Scottish" Office the nominal prerogative expressed in the term "*the authorized service*," has been the triumph of the one party; but it was dearly bought at the expense of the clause which was *designed* to enable the Bishops to give the *real authority* of prevailing use to the English Office. Still zealots will continue to quote *their* advantage, as if nothing had been won on the other side. In short, Canon XXI. is, and was meant to be, a Canon of *accommodation*. And the actual result has been what I have represented in my second Letter. I could not venture to state it as the privileged writer, who is "a Scotchman in every thought and feeling," has done, viz., that "in tenderness to her weak children," the Church "has indulged the use" of the English Office to 5 of her 7 BISHOPS, 6 of her 7 DEANS, and 80 of her 120 MINISTERS and CONGREGATIONS.

(C.)

"ACCORDING TO THE USE OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND," p. 35.

These words, or something equivalent, have been currently added to the Title of the so-called "Scottish" Office, from the time when that Office was, as the Canon speaks, "very generally used." Like many other Titles which have been allowed to stand long after they have ceased to be strictly true, this phraseology has continued to be reprinted, notwithstanding the *alteration* of the *Canon XXI.*, and the *still greater alteration* of the facts of the case, stated above. But to *acquiesce*, as a matter of course, in a *name* which has ceased to be correct, and to *invent a misnomer*, in order to serve an end, surely are not, in truth and charity, the same things. It will not therefore follow, that because the "Scottish" Office has been printed separately (though never by express Canonical Authority of the whole Church), again and again, and said to be "*The Office of Holy Communion according to the use of the Church in Scotland*," that therefore the Title of the new Prayer-Book, "*The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, according to the use, &c. &c.*," WHEN THE ENGLISH OFFICE IS OMITTED, is unobjectionable. To a candid mind, it would,

I think, occur at once that the *conjunction* (now made for the first time since 1637) of "Common Prayer" *with* "Administration of the Sacraments," requires that *the two* should be of *co-extensive signification*; that *one-half* of the Title, viz., "Common Prayer," should not mean *one thing*, as to the extent of its application, and *the other half*, viz., "Administration of the Sacraments," mean *another*. And under such circumstances, to say that nothing more has been done in the *new* Title of the *whole* Prayer-Book than had been done before in the *old* Title of the *single* so-called Scottish Office, appears to me, I must confess, not only highly sophistical, but positively untrue. Will G. H. F. have the *fairness* to explain this to the Readers of the *Guardian*?

(D.)

ON CANON XXVIII., p. 36.

"It is hereby enacted, that the words and Rubrical Directions of the English Liturgy shall be strictly adhered to."

At the last Review of the Canons, a very important step was made in dealing with the above clause, by the insertion of the words, "and Rubrical Directions." The precise value of that step is still much disputed. I have said more than once that both the expressions of the clause, viz., "Morning Service," and "English Liturgy," whatever may have been *the intention* of the several parties concerned in framing and altering the Canon,—and that they had *different intentions* there can be no doubt,—that both these expressions, *as they stand*, must be understood to include *the Administration of Holy Communion*; must be understood to include that which is the most important part of "Morning Service" and of "the English Liturgy." But how then, it will be asked, is this consistent with the provisions of Canon XXI. in favour of the "Scottish" Office? It is perfectly consistent, *when interpreted by that Canon*; as all Codes require to be interpreted by reference to, and comparison of, their several parts. The enactment here is, that "*the Words*" no less than "*the Rubrical Directions of the English Liturgy shall be strictly adhered to,*" *except as is provided otherwise*, with respect to "*the Words,*" *by Canon XXI.*, in favour of the superior authority of the "Scottish" Communion Office. But why was not this, if intended, more fully expressed? For the same reason which I have signified above under (B.) By the insertion of the clause, "and Rubrical Directions," a victory was won, though not a complete victory; a victory which implied, though it did not wantonly and offensively express, that between the *First General Synod* in 1811, and

the *last* in 1838, the use of the English Office had increased *four or five fold*.

I have seen it objected, that the expression of this same Canon, “*ordinary* part of Divine Service,” cannot be supposed to include the Administration of Holy Communion, for this reason ;—because in Canon XX. it is enacted, that “in every Congregation of this Church the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper shall be administered so often and at such times as that every Member of the Congregation, come to a proper time of life, may communicate *at least* three times in the year;” which seems to make the administration *extraordinary* rather than *ordinary*.

The objector perhaps was not aware that the same enactment is contained in the English Rubric (4th Rubric suffixed) and Canons; and yet the English Rubric (8th Rubric suffixed) also prescribes, that “in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Colleges,”—*i. e.* in all Churches which are to be the model for the rest,—“where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall *all* receive the Communion with the Priest *every Sunday* AT THE LEAST.” And further, there is a Note prefixed to the English Prayer-Book, which is supposed to imply *Daily* Communion. “Note also, that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel appointed for the Sunday shall serve *all the week after*.” In short, there can be no question that the “Ordinary Morning Divine Service,” at least on Sundays and Holidays, is regarded by the Church as *incomplete* without the Administration of Holy Communion.

(E.)

ON “THE SHORT LAW,” p. 37.

The Remarks upon this passage which have appeared in *the Guardian*, with the signature G. H. F., leave the matter very much where they found it. The writer of those Remarks does not deny that this “genuine *Scotch* Tradition” was derived from the *English* Non-Jurors; nor does he deny that it was aimed *against the fourth Commandment*. The actual extent, at *one period*, of the use (with respect to which Mr Lawson may have expressed himself somewhat incautiously) is very unimportant; because this is precisely a case such as I had in my eye, when I spoke of the written Law having come in, and *cut off the entail*; the Canon XXI. providing, that “in the use of either the Scotch or English Office, no alteration whatever shall take place.” And though “within the last fifty years,” as the same writer in *the*

Guardian informs us, "there have been more than thirty editions of the Scotch Communion Office," he has not been able to produce a *single copy* which contains this Tradition of "the Short Law." The Author of an able and temperate Article upon the Prayer-Book in the August number of *the Scottish Magazine*, has no doubt stated the matter more accurately than Mr Lawson; and I should probably have done so myself, making the same reference to *Bishop Horsley's Collation* (the original 4to edition of which I have had in my possession for many years), which G. H. F. has done, had I not been "*spatiis exclusus iniquis*" at the end of a Letter already so inordinately long. The account of this "use" in the Magazine I have referred to, is as follows:—

"All the intelligence we can afford comes to this, that *the Short Law*, as it has been called, was [invented and] adopted by some good Prelate or Presbyter of the last century, and has been a local custom occasionally observed to this day. We never heard it except in one Church, but we learn that it was not uncommon in a Northern Diocese."

(F.)

ON CANON XX., p. 37.

"For this purpose every Clergyman shall pay attention to the spirit and design of the Rubrics *prefixed* to the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper in the Book of Common Prayer."

Does this imply that Clergymen are *not* to "pay attention" to the Rubrics *suffixed* to that Order? Surely not. The prefixed Rubrics are here referred to for a *special purpose*. "For this purpose," viz., in order "that the people may the better prepare themselves for the participation of that venerable Sacrament;" which are the words of the preceding clause of the Canon. *In this view*, any mention of, or allusion to the *suffixed Rubrics* of the Office, would have been entirely out of place. This is further shown by the title of the Canon, which is:—"Requiring due Intimation and Preparation to be made for the Holy Communion." This Canon, therefore, seems to me not to contradict, but rather to confirm and enforce what has been said above (D.), respecting Canon xxviii.

It has been argued that the Rubrics suffixed to the English Communion Office cannot surely have any authority in those Congregations where it is not used. But it should be remembered, that the so-called Scottish Office is, after all, only a *fragment of a Service*, and not a *complete Liturgy* (to use the word "Liturgy" in its stricter sense),

and that the parts in which it is incomplete, are confessedly to be supplied from the English Book; whether this extends also to *the Rubrics* (as I think undoubtedly it does, *wherever the Scottish Rubric is silent*), must depend upon a right interpretation of the several enactments of the Canons which bear upon the question.

(G.)

“NOT BISHOP TORRY’S WORK,” p. 40.

Compare the documents contained under Letter IV., p. 21. And see my published Letter to Bishop Torry, *passim*.

(H.)

ON THE LETTER OF G. H. F. TO THE GUARDIAN, p. 54.

I have said that this Letter does not seem to me to require an answer.* As generally happens, where great professions are made to

* In short, I recognize in it the same disregard of “knowledge, truth, and charity,” the same “recklessness of assertion” which I have complained of all along. I have pointed out *two* examples to justify these *grave charges* at p. 55 and p. 64; I will here add *two more*.

1. Mr W. “asked the Bishop to do the *very same thing again*, by editing a Prayer-Book, which, IN ONE POINT, should be more in accordance with Mr W.’s individual wishes.” Let the Reader compare this with what occurs above, in Letter ~~Third, p. 14–20.~~ *Fourth p. 22 note*

2. I had written, “The Foundations of an EFFECTUAL CHURCH SYSTEM in this country are yet to be laid.” G. H. F. rejoins, “The Foundations OF THE CHURCH were laid here many hundred years ago.”

With regard to the remarks that follow in G. H. F.’s letter, though directed *against me*, I have myself made *very much the same in my last published Sermon*, “On occasion of the Offertory for Trinity College,” p. 17, *et alib*; and I shall therefore take the liberty of *passing them on* for the benefit and correction of our *last Ecclesiastical Scotch Historian*, Mr Stephen, in whom I find the following passage, vol. iv. p. 6:—“It need not, therefore, excite our special wonder, that our name and nation have been taken away, and our Candlestick has been removed; that we have been weighed in the balances, and found wanting in that true faith which consists in good works and holy obedience.”

This passage has been in print for *five years*; but I have not heard that G. H. F. has yet taken any steps to *correct* it, or to stigmatize the author of it as “THE ENEMY” of the Church.

the contrary, it is abundantly violent and personal ; and personal controversy is not my aim. "Strong language" I *profess* to use (as Holy Scripture teaches me to do) whenever PUBLIC ACTS appear to call for *such language, to characterize them properly* ; but mere personal bickerings and rejoinders, to which G. H. F. has exposed himself not a little, I utterly eschew. One remark only I will make, as forming a suitable conclusion of this publication, which has been called for by Newspaper, and for the most part anonymous, misstatements ; and as furnishing an all-sufficient illustration of the CAUSE which G. H. F. undertakes to defend. He avows that "he cannot but be glad to appeal against *local disputes* to the ENGLISH CHURCH PRESS." He seems to forget, what every Clergyman "of double Ordination" ought certainly to remember, that the Church, in this country, has her own proper Court of Appeal, viz., THE EPISCOPAL SYNOD ; though, of course, he cannot forget what that Synod HAS DONE in the present case. And he ought also to have remembered that English Churchmen, who are struggling to recover WHAT WE POSSESS, in the Jurisdiction of that Synod, will receive little encouragement from the assurance that, after all, *the true Court of Appeal* for all their differences will be—The SCOTTISH CHURCH PRESS !

ERRATUM.

In p. 16, I have used the expression, "the Scotch Office has no Rubrics ;" and the same occurs also in my published Letter to Bishop Torry, p. 7. The statement is incorrect, though the meaning is obvious in both places. I should have said, "has no Rubrics, *prefixed*, or *suffixed*," or "that relate to the matter in question."

POSTSCRIPT.

THE second Letter of G. H. F. to *The Guardian*, which has just reached me, ends with the following passage :—

“ Before concluding, I must express *my extreme regret* that Mr Wordsworth should have given circulation to a story *against a most excellent and zealous clergyman*, that he sent the Holy Communion to a sick person by post. . . . But the Clergyman referred to denies that *there is any truth* in the report ; and I am sure your readers will share my surprise at finding the Reverend Charles Wordsworth imitating the *Record*, by giving currency to such a story, without being quite sure that it was not a *slander*.”

This refers to a note which appeared in Letter Fifth, but which I have suppressed in this reprint.

The note was as follows :—

“ Since my former Letter was written, a case has come to my knowledge in which the Holy Sacrament was sent to a sick person by the post. Surely there is need to scruple at a Rubric which would open the door wider for such practices.”

The passage *was* suppressed for two reasons ; *first*, Because I understood that it had given offence to an individual, though *no individual was pointed at directly or indirectly* ; and I had not the least idea that the words would *touch* an individual ; and, *secondly*, Because I was afterwards informed that the Sacrament was not sent by *the post*, but in a *parcel* or *letter*.

The story must needs be “ A SLANDER,” although there are 120 Clergy in our Communion to whom it might refer, and although G. H. F. doubts whether the fact itself, if true, “ could be proved wrong.”

But, as I have before observed, when controversialists begin with professions of being *fair* and *gentle*, it can generally be anticipated how they will *end*. As G. H. F. assures me that the Clergyman referred to denies that there is *any truth* in the report, having already had correspondence with him (in which, however, he has said *nothing of the kind*), I will immediately place myself in his hands, to make whatever apology or amends he may point out; though, as I have said, I had not *named him either directly or indirectly*, and had no other object in what I wrote but to illustrate the new Rubric, which *commands* the Priest to reserve, and so would seem to place him in the hands of his Sick People to *require* the Sacrament to be *brought* or *sent* to them.

With regard to the Letter itself (besides the discovery of this new species of DEFAMATION, viz., of a case *wherein Nobody is named, or hinted at, and Somebody "denies" that he has done Anything of the kind*), the only other new point is the observation that the *English Rubrics* cannot be binding upon us, because they do not accord in one minute particular, with respect to communicating at the least three times a year, with the *Scotch Canons*. It might as well, or rather better, be argued that they cannot be binding in England, because, in one or two similar minutiae, *e. g.* in giving notice of the Holy Communion, they do not seem to be consistent one with another.

August 29, 1850.





